Theological Seminary.
PRINCETON, N. J.
Case,
Shelf,
Book,
Division SCC
Section 1491

Mr. HOADLY's MEASURES of SUBMISSION TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE Enquired into, and Disprov'd.

Wherein is shewn that Mr. HOADLY has by no Means proved the lawfulness of forcibly Resisting the Supreme Magistrate in any Case; but after all he has said to the contrary, the Apostle's Doctrine still holds true, That *whosoever Resisteth the Power, Resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that Resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

By a Presbyter of the Church of ENGLAND.
Nathanael Spinckes. M. A.

Wo to all the Princes upon Earth, if this Doctrine [*of Resistance*] be true, and becometh popular; if the Multitude believe this, the Prince not armed with the Scales of the *Leviathan*, that is, with irresistible Power, can never be safe from the Spears, and Barbed Irons, which their Ambition and presumed Interest will provide, and their Malice will sharpen, and their passionate Violence throw against him. If the Beast we speak of but knows its own strength, it will never be manag'd: Wherefore such as own these Pernicious Doctrines, Destructive to all Societies of Men, may be said to have Wolves Heads, as the Laws of old were wont to speak concerning Excommunicated Persons; and are, like those Ravenous Beasts, so far from deserving our Love and Care, *That they ought to be destroyed at the Common Charge. The Creed of Mr.* Hobbes *Examined, By his Grace the present* Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury. Edit.* 2d. P. 170, 171. *Ed. 1. p. 160, 161.*

LONDON,
Printed for *W. Taylor* at the *Ship* in *Pater-noster-Row*, 1711.

ZEal for the Eſtabliſh'd Religion Recommended: In a Sermon preach'd at the Aſſizes held at *Salop*, *Auguſt* 4. 1710. by *Fred. Cornwall*, M. A. Vicar of *Bromfield*. Publiſh'd at the Unanimous Requeſt of the High Sheriff and the Gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the ſaid County. *Price* 3 *d.* or 20 *s. per* Hundred.

Hiſtoriæ Sacræ Libri VII. in quibus Narrantur res Geſtæ Veterum Patriarcharum, Judæorum, & Chriſtianorum, à primâ Mundi Origine uſq; ad excidium Hieroſolymitanum. Per *Guil. Nicholſum*. In uſum Scholarum Juventutis Chriſtianæ.

Miſcellanea Antiqua: Containing (1.) the Life and Death of K. *James* V. of *Scotland*, in which is the Beginning of the Reformation in that Kingdom: An Account of the Sufferings of the renowned Lady *Jane Douglaſs*, *&c.* 2. The Navigation of that King round *Scotland*, the *Orkney* and *Weſtern* Iſles, *&c.* 3. The Camelion: Or, Crafty Stateſman, by *George Buchanan*: Never before publiſhed.

Perſpective made Eaſy: Or, The Art of repreſenting all manner of Objects, as they appear to the Eye, in all Scituations; containing the Elements of Deſigning and Painting: illuſtrated with above Fifty Figures in Copper. Written Originally in *French* by Father *Lamy*, and tranſlated by an Officer of Her Majeſty's Ordnance.

The Compleat Fencing-Maſter, by Sir *W. Hope*, Kt. with Cuts.

A Collection of Divine Hymns and Poems on ſeveral Occaſions. By the Earl of *Roſcommon*, Mr. *Dryden*, Mr. *Norris*, Mrs. *Kath. Phillips*, *Philomela*, and others. Publiſhed by Mrs. *Singer*; moſt of them never before Printed.

The Book of Common-prayer, and Adminiſtration of the Sacrament, according to the Uſe of the *Church of England*, with the Apoſtles, and an Account of the Original of the Faſts and Feaſts of the Church, with ſeveral of the Rubricks occaſionally explain'd. By *William Nichols*, D. D. in 8*o*. Price 6 *s.*

Three ſhort Treatiſes, *viz.* (1.) A modeſt Plea for the Clergy. (2.) A Sermon of the Sacerdotal Benediction. (3.) A Diſcourſe to undeceive the People in point of Tithes, *&c.* Publiſh'd by Dr. *George Hickes*, in defence of the *Prieſthood* and true *Rights of the Church*, againſt the ſlanderous and reproachful Treatment of the Clergy, in a late Book of pernicious and blaſphemous Doctrines, entitul'd, *The Rights of the Church.*

The Path to Liberty: Or, the Method of Man's Redemption, by our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: together with Chriſtian Liberty rightly Stated and Maintain'd, againſt the impious Tenets of Ancient Hereticks, now lately Revived, and with great boldneſs publiſhed by ſome Modern Writers. By *Tho. Rawbone*, M. A. Late Rector of *Norton under Hamden* in *Somerſetſhire*. With a Recommendatory Preface by Dr. *Edwards*, Principal of *Jeſus College*, *Oxon.*

THE

PREFACE.

THO' Mr. *Hoadly*'s Principles have not been suffer'd to escape, without some just and pertinent Animadversions upon them, by some of the Learned and more Orthodox Clergy, yet forasmuch as his Celebrated *Measures of Submission* have not hitherto had a particular Answer to them, and himself, and some of his Admirers seem from hence to conclude that Discourse Unanswerable; I have therefore undertaken to shew their Mistake, and do right to a much Injur'd Branch of our Religion, by Rescuing the Apostle's Doctrine, *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. from the forced and unnatural Interpretation there put upon it. Some Mis-representations may be born with, and Errors conniv'd at, whilst the tendency of them appears to have no very dangerous Consequence. But when the Plain, Known, Injunctions of Christianity, that have been taught in Scripture, and owned and practis'd as necessary Duties, both in the Primitive, and our own and

other Modern Churches, come to be insulted, and the Holy Bible it self is press'd to serve a Party, it is high time to stand up for their Defence against such Assailants. And I am apt to think, it is matter of just Enquiry, why this Book has lain so long unanswered, rather than why I thus appear against it at length.

A Doctrine deliver'd in Scripture, as NON-RESISTANCE is, and strongly backed from time to time, both by Arguments and Practice, especially from the Suffering of our Blessed Lord to the end of the Ten Persecutions, I always took to be of such invincible force, that he had need be well fortified, with a fixed Resolution, and good Assurance, to have *robur & æs triplex circa pectus*, who should attempt to overthrow it. And I could not but be surpriz'd to see Mr. *H.* engage in so odd and unchristian an Undertaking, and so Dogmatical and Positive in it, as if he had found out some hidden Stream of Truth, that had run underground for many Ages together, and might have done so still, had not he, and some others of his Complexion, not long since, happily Discover'd the Current, and made a way for its eruption, to the singular Benefit, as they pretend, of all that will partake of it.

Thus

Thus much himself seems to insinuate, in Answer to his 24th Objection, *p.* 153, where he Modestly compares himself to the first Reformers, telling us, *There was a time in which any one who having spoken against* Transubstantiation, *and many other absurd Opinions, would have had the same sort of Objection made against him*, as is now against himself. As also at other times he Triumphantly boasts,* that his Book had *been long enough in the World to engage all, who are heartily concerned, against the Principles maintained in it, to endeavour to their utmost to hinder the Pernicious Effects of them*, &c. That † *not the least Reply had been given to it, besides general and positive Affirmations to the contrary*; and again, That ‖ the *Replies given* by him *to every Argument in favour of* Absolute Non-resistance, *will be esteemed, by all good Judges, a great Advantage to the contrary Cause.*

And yet neither is this any new Discovery of his own, but what *Junius Brutus*, and *Doleman*, and *Buchanan*, and *Milton*, and *Sa. Johnson*, and other Advocates for Rebellion, as to the main of it, have taught before him, and have been applauded for it by their Party, as well as He. But yet whose Pernicious Principles, have on the

* *Pref. to the 2d Edit.* p. 1. † *Answer to the Lord Bishop of* Exeter's *Sermon*, p. 10. ‖ *The same Answer* p. 51.

other hand, been so often and fully expos'd, as one would have thought might have effectually prevented any Man of Conscience and Understanding, from ever teaching the same Doctrines more. For thanks be to God, as these Republican Demagogues have in their several times endeavoured to Corrupt the Truth, and lay the Foundation, and spread the Seeds of Treason and Rebellion; so have there not been wanting others of steady loyal Principles, who have had both Will and Ability to Extirpate the Mischievous and Destructive Seeds sown by them, and to *put* People *in mind*, both of the indispensable Obligation they are under, *to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*, and withal of the great Encouragement they have to depend upon God's Good Providence for Safety and Defence at such times of Fear and Danger, wherein Mr. *H.* and his Fraternity would persuade them, rather to trust *an Arm of Flesh* than *in the Living God*; to take their Protection out of God's Hands into their own, and rely upon an Unchristian Self-defence, than Patiently take up their Cross, and follow their Lord, through all the Trials and Sufferings he may at any time, in his infinite Wisdom, see fit to exercise them with.

If we regard this World only, I can by no means think the Doctrine of Resistance

to

to be for the Benefit of Human Society. But when we look forward to another Life, and call to mind the infinite concern we ought all to have for that, and consider withal, how expresly *Resistance of the Higher Powers* is forbidden in Scripture, and what terrible Vengeance is threatned to the Authors of it, it amazes me to find that a Man of Ingenuity, and an appearance of Piety and Sincerity, shou'd ever undertake the Patronage of it.

See how severe a Character the Learned Bishop of *Sarum* gives of such Enemies both to Loyalty and true Religion, how hard a Censure he passes upon Themselves and their Doctrine: * *Amongst all the Heresies this Age has Spawned, there is not one,* says his Lordship, *more contrary to the whole Design of Religion, and more destructive of Mankind, than is that* Bloody Opinion of Defending *Religion by Arms, and of Forcible Resistance upon the colour of Religion. The Wisdom of that Policy is* Earthly, Sensual, Devilish, *savouring of a Carnal, Unmortified, and Impatient Mind, that cannot bear the Cross, nor trust to the Providence of God.* And again, † St. Paul's *Words in the* 13*th to the* Romans *are so expres, that methinks they should strike a Terror into all Men from Resisting the Superior Powers, lest*

* *Pref. to the Vindication of the Church and State of* Scotland. † *First Conference,* p. 40.

they Resist the Ordinance of God, and receive **Damnation**. And a little after, * *These Words of St.* Paul *being, as at first addressed to the* Romans, *so also designed by the Holy Ghost to be a part of the Rule of all Christians, do prove, that whoever hath the Supreme Power, is to be submitted to,* **and never Resisted.** And again upon another occasion, † *But the same Equality of Justice and Freedom that obliged me to lay open this, ties me to tax all those who pretend a great heat against* Rome, *and value themselves on their abhorring all the Doctrines and Practices of that Church, and yet have carried along with them one of their most Pestiferous Opinions, pretending Reformation, when they would bring all under Confusion; and vouching the Cause and Work of God, when they were destroying the Authority he had set up, and opposing those impow'red by him: And the more Piety and Devotion such daring Pretenders put on, it still brings the greater stain and imputation on Religion, as if it gave a Patrocíny to* **those Practices it so plainly Condemns.** *This is,* Judas *like, to kiss our Master when we betray him, and to own a zeal for Religion, when we engage in* **Courses that disgrace and destroy it.** *But, Blessed be God,* **our Church hates and condemns this Doctrine, from what hand**

* P. 41. † *His Lordship's Sermon at* Covent-Garden, *of* Subjection for Conscience sake, *p.* 29, 30.

soever

soever it come, and hath established the Rights and Authority of Princes, on sure and unalterable Foundations, enjoining an intire Obedience to all the Lawful Commands of Authority, and an absolute Submission to that Supream Power, God hath put in our Sovereign's Hands. *This* Doctrine we justly Glory in, *and if any that had their Baptism and Education in our Church, have turned Renegades from this, they proved no less* Enemies to the Church her self, *than to the Civil Authority. So that their* Apostasy *leaves no blame on our Church, which Glories in nothing more, than a well-temper'd Reformation, from the later Corruptions, which the dark Ages brought in, to the* Pure and Primitive Doctrines *which our Saviour and his Apostles Taught, and the first Christians Retained and Practised for many Ages.* And again once more, * *Above all these we must never forget the Station in which God has put us, as we are Subjects under a Lawful Prince, to whom we are tied both by Divine and Human Laws; and even the* Lion's Mouth *it self opening to Devour us, can never excuse us from our Obligation* to Submit and Suffer, *if God had so ordered it by his Providence, that we had not the Blessing of being Born under a Prince, that is the* Defender of the Faith, *but were born*

* *Sermon at the Rolls.* Nov. 5. 1684. *p.* 27, 28, 29.

under one that would deliver us up to the Lion. — *When we go out of the way of Patience and Submission, of Obedience and of bearing the Cross; when we give Scope to Passion and Rage, to Jealousie and Mistrust, and upon this Fermentation in our Minds, we break out into Wars and Rebellions, we forget that the God whom we serve is Almighty, and can save us either from a devouring Fire, or a* Lion's Mouth; *and either will save us from these, or reward us infinitely for them: We forget that the Saviour, whom we follow, was* made Perfect by Sufferings; *and that we become then truly his Disciples, when we bear his Cross, even tho' we should be crushed under it: We forget that our Religion ought to Inspire us, with a contempt of Life and the World, and with meekness and lowliness of Mind: We forget that we are the Followers of that Glorious Cloud of Witnesses, who have* by Faith and Patience inherited the Promises, *and have gone to take Possession of the Kingdom that was prepared for them, thro' Fire, and thro' Blood, but it was their own Blood. And to summ up all, we forget that our Reformation was the shaking off of Popery, that is, a Bloody Conspiracy against the Souls and the Bodies of Men, against the Souls of the Weak, and the Bodies of the Firm, but Innocent Professors of this Holy Religion. We are not to share with them in their Cruelty, nor to imitate them in their*

Rebellion

Rebellion. Thus does his Lordſhip moſt ſolidly eſtabliſh, and emphatically invite to the Practice of what Mr. *H.* ſo reſolutely and undutifully ſets himſelf to oppoſe, and which he ſo induſtriouſly decries, * *as a greater oppoſition to the Will of God, than the contrary.*

To the ſame purpoſe likewiſe ſpeaks the late Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* Dr. *Tillotſon*, in his Serious and Pathetick Letter to the Lord *Ruſſel*, Written to his Lordſhip juſt before his Death, *out of tender Compaſſion to his Caſe, and that he might not leave the World in a Deluſion and falſe Peace, to the hindrance of his Eternal Welfare.* This Letter was Printed for *R. Baldwin* in 1683. And in it he argues upon the Suppoſition of *our Religion and Rights being invaded*, and preſſes my Lord even in this caſe to conſider, That *the Chriſtian Religion doth plainly forbid the Reſiſtance of Authority*; adding, *That tho' our Religion be eſtabliſhed by Law, yet in the ſame Law which eſtabliſhes our Religion, it is declared that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatſoever to take up Arms*, &c. *Beſides that there is a particular Law declaring* the Power of the Militia to be ſolely in the King; *And that ties the Hands of Subjects, tho' the Law of Nature, and the general Rules of Scripture*

* *Serm.* p. 8.

had

had left us at Liberty, which, says his Grace, *I believe they do not*; affirming withal, that *his Lordship's Opinion* [in favour of Resistance] *was contrary to the declared Doctrine of all Protestant Churches*, and that it deserv'd therefore to be consider'd, *how well it would agree with an avowed Asserting of the* Protestant Religion, *to go contrary to the* General Doctrine of Protestants.

I do not aim at more in what I am now contending for, than these Two famous Prelates have so fully and positively Asserted. And so long as I keep to this Point, I hope none who have a Reverence for these great Names, will think me to blame, for undertaking the Defence of Their Doctrine. Mr. *H.* and others of his Principles, may venture to contradict them if they Please, but for my part, I am rather for adhering to what they have Taught, so agreeably to the Precepts of Christianity, and the Doctrine of other Protestants, and the Doctrines and Laws of our own Church and State.

And indeed whatsoever others may judge of Mr. *H*'s Performance, either in his Sermon, or its Vindication, I see nothing to make me, and I hope I have shewn in the following Tract, that there is no Reason for any one else to doubt, but St. *Paul* both meant as he said, and was also

also in the Right, when he taught, that *whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.* And I am moreover humbly of Opinion, with his Grace the Lord Arch-bishop of *York*, that * **These Words are so plain as to need no Comment.** Nor should they have had any from me, had not Mr. *H*'s undue manner of handling them compell'd me to it.

Mr. *H.* may complain perhaps, that I do not regard what he has said, because in my Paraphrase on the 3d Verse of *Rom.* 13. I affirm *the most outragious Tyrant to be less Pernicious to any Nation or Kingdom, than a Liberty for every one to do that which is Right in his own Eyes.* But I do assure him, I have seriously consider'd his several Replies to the Fifth Objection, together with his Repetitions of them in other Words in his Preface, *P.* xi, xii, and xxi, xxii, xxiii, and have done it with all the Impartiality I could. And if I have not any where given a particular Answer to what is there advanced, I hope I may fairly be excused, considering that some of it depends only upon Mr. *H*'s bare Assertion, some of it is too hot for my Fingers, and some of it I have actually disproved.

* *Serm. before the H. of Peers*, Jan. 30, 1699-1700. p. 20.

But

But as to his Doctrine in general, had I no other Argument, as I ſhall ſhew I have divers, this alone would be to me an invincible Prejudice againſt it, that it allows Almighty God ſo little to do, in the Preſervation of the Publick Safety and Happineſs. It were well becoming a Divine to *caſt his care upon God*, and rely upon him for Protection, and to perſuade others, as he has opportunity, to do the ſame, inaſmuch as God has promis'd by his Apoſtle S. *Peter* * to take care of thoſe that do ſo. *Caſting all your care upon him*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *for he careth for you.*

And there is a particular reaſon for Dependance upon him in relation to Kingdoms and Nations, becauſe the Preſent is the only time of Rewarding and Puniſhing them, as ſuch; foraſmuch as all Societies here will be diſſolved in the other World, and each one will be to anſwer for himſelf conſider'd as a ſingle Perſon, whether a Righteous Man or a Sinner, not as a Member of this or that People or Body of Men. So that Kingdoms and Societies muſt have their Reward and Puniſhment in this World, or not at all, ſince it will be too late for it in the other, when they will be no more. And that they certainly

* 1 S. *Pet.* 5. 7.

ſhall

ſhall be more or leſs happy here, accordingly as they take care to ſerve and pleaſe God, or allow themſelves to diſobey him, he has ſufficiently enformed us by his Prophet *Jeremiah*, † *At what inſtant I ſhall ſpeak concerning a Nation, or concerning a Kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to deſtroy it; If that Nation againſt whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what inſtant I ſhall ſpeak concerning a Nation, and concerning a Kingdom, to build and to plant it; If it do evil in my ſight, that it obey not my voice, then will I repent of the good, wherewith I ſaid I would benefit them.* This therefore is a peculiar reaſon for depending upon God, for the Preſervation of any Community, ſo long as they make it their buſineſs to approve themſelves to him in well doing; and is moreover a powerful Encouragement, for ſubmitting to any kind of Tryal he ſhall think fit to bring us into, in hope of a happy Deliverance in his due time, fully perſuading our ſelves, that whatever temptation befals us, he will be mindful of us, and if we be not wanting to do our part, *will make a way for our eſcape, that we may be able to bear it.* This I am very ſure is the Deportment that becomes

† Ch. 18. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Chriſtians

Christians under their greatest Fears or Dangers, Pressures or Misfortunes. And it is at any time a far likelier way to a happy settlement, than taking upon our selves to be our own Deliverers, and thereby probably involving our selves in much heavier Miseries than we are labouring to avoid.

And how plausible soever it may appear, to such as have not duly weighed it, no considering Person but must acknowledge it strange for an Ambassador of Jesus Christ, a Preacher of his Gospel, to direct his Auditors or Readers to a quite contrary course, to put them upon such a method of Safety, as savours not of the Spirit of the Gospel, and an *Epicurus*, or a *Macchiavel*, a *Milton*, *Tindal*, or *Toland*, would as readily have directed to. Mr. *H.* ought to have remembred whose Disciple he professes himself to be, by whose Commission he acts as a Minister, and whose Gospel he is a Minister of; and then he could hardly have forborn to give at least some hint to his Hearers, that they should look up to Almighty God, and have an eye always at his Providence, and not suffer themselves to be affrighted out of their Wits and their Duty, by whatsoever apprehension of Danger, either to Themselves, or the Society they belong to. But the truth is, I can see nothing of this nature in

all

all his Book; in which I do not remember that he takes notice of the Providence of God, more than once, from one end of it to the other: And then it is not done, as might reasonably have been expected, to recommend the Consideration and Admiration of God's Goodness to his Creatures, and to our selves in particular, but quite the contrary, to caution against relying too easily upon it, with hope of relief when, according to him, there is none to be expected. The Passage here hinted at is *p.* 70th of his *Vindication*, where treating of the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, he affirms, *it is so far from being true, that this Doctrine would prevent* Publick Misery, *that it is most evident, the Universal Reception of it could end in nothing but Slavery and Misery upon the present Age, and upon the Generations to come, unless it can be proved, that it is the Custom of* Providence *miraculously to interpose in the defence of a* Nation, *which will not defend it self; or to save a People by any other means, but those of Humane Resistance and Opposition.* This is Mr. *H*'s Doctrine. And tho' it is not a proper place for examining the truth of it here, and shewing * what wonderful Deliverances God has oftentimes

* *See Dr.* Falkner's Christian Loyalty. B. 2. Ch. 2. p. 383, *&c.*

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

wrought

wrought for his People, both Jews and Christians, and what signal Instances of his Goodness in this kind, we of this Nation have had, for encouraging our Dependance upon him for the future; especially since I shall have another more convenient occasion for it; yet I cannot pass it by without observing how well suited it is to the Genius of this loose, irreligious, atheistical Age. And I do not much wonder that it should be applauded by that sort of Men, when I recollect how agreeable it is to their Principles, or rather want of Principles; inasmuch as themselves would hardly have written otherwise upon the same Argument.

Which I do not mention with any design of charging M. *H.* with an intent to gratify those avowed Enemies, not only to the Church of *England*, but to Christianity in general, and to all Divine Revelation. For I sincerely profess, I do not suspect him to have had any inclination that way. Only I conceive his Head to have been so full of his fine Hypothesis, concerning the great need and usefulness of Resistance upon occasion, that he overlook'd this ill effect of it. And I therefore take notice of it here, to the end he may be prevailed with, to consider the matter seriously with himself, and as in the presence of Almighty God,

and

and try whether he can ſtill ſatisfy himſelf, that he has paid that due Deference to Providence, which was to have been expected from a ſincere Chriſtian, and one of his Sacred Profeſſion. And could he but be invited, impartially to examine himſelf in this reſpect, I cannot but hope he would conclude it more reaſonable, for his Scheme of Politicks to be regulated, by the Doctrine of Providence, and the plain Words of his Text, than that this comfortable Doctrine be laid aſide, and his Text miſinterpreted to make room for That.

It is a very good ſaying of the late Learned Dean of S. *Paul's*, and not unworthy of Mr. *H*'s deliberate Attention; and I leave it with him for that reaſon. † *When on one ſide there is a plain and expreſs Revelation of the Will of God, and on the other ſide ſome ſhew and appearance of Reaſon, I think there can be no diſpute which ſide we chuſe; unleſs a Man think it doubtful, which is the moſt certain and infallible Rule, Scripture, or meer natural Reaſon.* This is a Poſition Mr. *H.* with all his Ingenuity, will never be able to diſprove. And yet if it hold true, the neceſſary conſequence of it is, That the Scripture being plainly againſt Mr. *H*'s Doctrine, all his pretended Rea-

† *Caſe of Reſiſtance*, p. 186.

ſons to the contrary, were they much ſtronger and better founded than they are, muſt vail to it. Thus much is undoubtedly owing from him as a Chriſtian.

But then conſidered as a Preacher of Chriſtianity, it is incumbent upon him to put People in mind of another Life, and preſs to an eſpecial Regard for it, as our great Concern, and which ought to be the end and aim of all our Endeavours. He ſhould call upon his Followers, and warn them to *give diligence for making their calling and election ſure, and working out their Salvation with fear and trembling.* And in any doubtful Caſe, where the Bounds of their Duty are not ſo clearly fixed, but that Honeſt and Good Men may differ in their Senſe of it (which is the moſt Mr. *H.* can ſuppoſe, or deſire to be admitted in the matter now under debate) he ſhould admoniſh them to be very Cautious, leſt their Concern for the things of this World tempt them, to what may any way endanger their Eternal Welfare in the other.

Yet if I can underſtand Mr. *H.* he has ſhewn no regard for our better Part, throughout his whole Diſcourſe, in compariſon of the Temporal Welfare of Humane Society. The Happineſs and Safety of the Publick is the only Cynoſure by which he ſteers his whole courſe, from his firſt ſetting

ting out to the end of it. And to serve this sole end of all his Scheme, he has made it his business to wrest his Text to such a Sense as it can no way bear, and as, I am confident, he would not have thought it capable of, if he had his thoughts as closely fixed upon the infinite Glories of the other State, as they were upon the Security and Happiness of This. Which is another means whereby he has (I persuade my self unwarily) recommended his Book to the Approbation of the looser sort. And his not forseeing any such ill consequences of this Procedure, does not make it the less exceptionable in it self, or the less pernicious in its effects; but it calls loudly upon himself to retract, or at least correct it, so soon as ever he shall be made sensible of it. And I hope, and earnestly beseech him, for his own sake, as well as for the better instruction of such as may have been misled by him, that when he writes again, he will take care to let a little more of the Christian appear in what he writes; that he will shew some regard to the Promises of the Gospel, and not set up purely for a Politician, and resolve all, as he does at present, into Temporal Safety and Convenience; and as a Divine, will invite his Readers to a dependance upon God, and a submission to his Will, and an earnest expectation of a

better ſtate; and will not ſtudy ſo exceſſively to recommend a concern for the Welfare and Happineſs of this World, to ſuch as are too prone to it of themſelves, and ſo have much more need to be put in mind of the other, and excited to a diligent Preparation for it, whatever becomes of themſelves, and all they eſteem deareſt here below.

Such is the groſs Corruption of Human Nature, that Mankind are generally more inclinable, to exceed in kindneſs to their temporal Welfare, than to ſlight and neglect it. And it is a Preacher of the Goſpel's buſineſs, to do what in him lies, towards raiſing up their Affections to the things above, engaging them by all means in their Power, to make ſure of a happy Eternity, rather than tell them, how far in his Judgment, they may indulge their preſent Eaſe and Quiet, and yet poſſibly obtain that too. I am ſure Mr. *H.* can never be too induſtrious in recommending the care and love of another Life; but I am ſorry to ſay, that he has ſhewn too much regard to this, and more I hope than he will ſuffer himſelf to ſhew for the future.

And the rather, if we again take the matter in another view, whereby to ſee the more clearly, whether he has diſcharg'd his Office as a Preacher, with all that Fidelity

and

and Care that was to be expected from him. Now supposing one to excite his Auditors, with all the zeal he can, to be kind and beneficial to their Neighbours, and particularly *to be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate* of the good things God has bless'd them with, for the relief of the sick, the maim'd, the decrepit or any otherwise truly indigent and necessitous; and another at the same time to employ all his Abilities on the other hand, in encouraging to be saving and tenacious, telling them it is not only *Lawful* but *Glorious* to get Riches by all honest means, and that he who takes not this course to provide for his Family, *has denied the Faith, and is worse than an Infidel.* Suppose again that one earnestly Preaches up the Doctrine of Self-denial and Mortification, or at least, an exact Temperance in all Cases; whilst another, is earnest in persuading to a free use of God's Blessings, urging to his Auditors, that *every Creature of God is Good, if it be used with Thanksgiving*, and they need not therefore be so abstemious, as some would causelessly advise them to be; possibly endeavouring moreover to state the Case, what Liberty a Man may take in this respect, and how near he may come to Riot and Excess, without being guilty of the sin of Intemperance. Once more, suppose a Preacher instructing

his Auditory in the Duty of Forgiving Affronts and Injuries, and inviting and preſſing to the Practice of it, begging of them diligently to attend to, and conſtantly keep in mind, thoſe Words of our Bleſſed Saviour, St *Matt.* 6. 14, 15, *If ye forgive Men their Treſpaſſes, your Heavenly Father will alſo forgive you. But if ye forgive not Men their Treſpaſſes, neither will your heavenly Father forgive your Treſpaſſes*; and ſuppoſe at the ſame time, another teaching the inconvenience of ſuch a meek Paſſive Deportment, and that the certain effect of it, will be, that *veterem ferendo injuriam invitabunt novam*, they muſt expect to be ſo much the more inſulted for it, and ſtudiouſly informing them in what inſtances he fancies, they may lawfully take upon them to right themſelves, how far they may poſſibly go, in Judging and Puniſhing the Injurious Perſons, and exhorting, by no means to be afraid or cautious, but freely to uſe all the Liberty he allows them in this reſpect. I preſume no one will think it difficult to determine, whether Sort of theſe Preachers, are moſt likely to prepare their Hearers for the Kingdom of Heaven; which of them beſt anſwer the Deſign of our Saviour's Commiſſion to Preach the Goſpel, and are like to ſee moſt fruit of their Labour, in a Licentious Age, wherein every Conceſſion is apt to be

ſtretch'd

ſtretch'd beyond all reaſon, in favour of Mens Luſts, Paſſions, and Worldly Intereſts.

Indeed, were Mankind ſo over zealous in the performance of their Duty, as to need a Caution to be given them, That they do not inconſiderately run themſelves upon unneceſſary Difficulties and Inconveniencies, like ſuch of the Ancient Martyrs, as voluntarily expoſed themſelves to the fury of their Perſecutors, when not ſought for by them, it might be fit to take off the edge of their Zeal, and let them know they might poſſibly ſerve the ends of Religion better, by ſparing themſelves, to do good in their Generation, and influence others who have great need of ſuch Examples, to excite them to the ways of Holineſs.

But alas! whoſoever obſerves the lamentable ſtate of this remiſs degenerate Age, muſt inevitably be ſenſible how little occaſion there is for this ſort of Doctrine: And that all the moſt Indefatigable endeavours of the moſt pious and laborious Preachers are not enough to engage the Generality of thoſe that call themſelves Chriſtians, even to the loweſt pitch of true Godlineſs and Virtue; and that therefore all attempts of this nature are of a very dangerous conſequence, tho' the Preacher be ſo *cautious and prudent*, as really to recommend nothing but what in

it self is lawful. But if he happen to exceed in the Liberties he allows, and so invites, and earnestly encourages to the Practice of what is sinful, especially if he set up Notions of his own in direct opposition to his Text, and other parts of the Holy Scripture, how dreadful must his account be at the last day, tho' he had not been conscious to himself of any ill design in what he did? This Question I would beg leave to recommend to Mr. *H*'s. Consideration. And when he has decided it, he may please to apply it, and see if himself be no way concern'd in it.

That his Doctrine is false, I promise my self I shall have fully evinced, before I have finished this undertaking. At present I would offer these following Considerations, which seem to me to serve in a good measure towards the deciding this Controversy:

1. Upon Mr. *H*'s. Principle no General of an Army can have a Power of commanding his Soldiers upon any desperate Engagement or Attack, because their * *Good cannot be the same with any thing inconsistent with it, with the private Advantage* of their General, or with *the imaginary Interest of any Person whatsoever, who is attempting the Destruction*

* *Pref.* p. 8.

of

of it. If it be ſaid, what they are put upon is for the Good not of the General only, but the Publick, and what they muſt be ſuppoſed to have oblig'd themſelves to, when they were Liſted into their Countries ſervice; Mr. *H.* could eaſily reply to this, that themſelves are to judge whether this ſervice be for their Countries Good; and again, whether they are not to have a greater concern for their own Safety, to which the great Duty of Self-preſervation calls upon them to have an eſpecial regard. He could tell them, *it is their* * *indiſpenſable Duty to ſubmit to ſuch* Commanders *as anſwer the good End of their Inſtitution, ſuch as promote the Good* of thoſe that are under them, *and are continually attending upon this* very thing. But if theſe Commanders ſeek the hurt of the Army, by putting them upon ſuch hard Services as in all appearance tend to their inevitable Deſtruction, to oppoſe them in this Caſe cannot be to oppoſe a juſt *Authority: Nay a Paſſive Non-Reſiſtance*, but eſpecially a quiet and ready Submiſſion and Obedience to ſuch unreaſonable Commands, would appear upon examination, to be a much greater oppoſition *to the Will of God than the contrary*; And as for any Contract made at their Entrance into the Service,

* *Serm.* p. 7.

this

this is always to be underſtood to mean, only ſo far as might be juſt and reaſonable, and for their own and the Publick Benefit and Advantage. Neither of which ends they can imagine to be anſwer'd, by the loſs of ſo many brave Men as are like to fall in the Attempt required of them. Wherefore they cannot ſee, how they are any way oblig'd to it; and if they run upon an unneceſſary danger and die by it, their Blood will be upon their own Heads. And ſo under a Notion of preſerving their Lives, the Publick comes to be deprived, and poſſibly may be entirely ruined for want of their Aſſiſtance in a time of great Danger and Diſtreſs. Yet this, as unreaſonable as it is in it ſelf, and as diſadvantageous as it may prove to the Publick, I take to be one neceſſary Conſequence of Mr. *H*'s Doctrine. Another is, that,

2. This Doctrine Condemns the ſtate of Slavery, as utterly Unlawful. Tho' not only our Bleſſed Saviour no where condemns it, * even when he has occaſion to ſpeak of it, but his Apoſtle St. *Paul* evidently allows of it as lawful, 1 *Cor.* 7. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. *Let every man abide in the ſame calling, wherein he is call'd. Art*

* *Particularly St.* Matt. 24. 50, 51.

thou

thou called being a Servant; that is, a Slave; *care not for it*; *but if thou mayſt be made free, uſe it rather*, &c. Here St. *Paul* allows of ſuch a ſtate of Bondage, and admoniſhes thoſe that were in it, not to look upon themſelves as any way Diſcharg'd from it by their embracing Chriſtianity. But it is a difficult matter to reconcile this Admonition of the Apoſtle, with Mr. *H*'s. notion of Public Good, and the Reſiſtance he recommends in order to it. For according to his way of arguing, How can it be for the Good of Mankind, that ſuch great Numbers as were in Slavery heretofore, and are ſtill in ſome places, ſhould be ſubjected to the will of one Man, to Tyrannize over them, to maintain them as he pleaſes, even like the *Prodigal Son* in our Saviour's Parable, who * deſired *to feed with the Swine* upon their Husks, *and no Man gave unto him*; (*a*) to Condemn them to the hardeſt Labour, and (*b*) Chain them to it, (*c*) to Stigmatize them, (*d*) to Crucify them

---

* *St.* Luke 15, 16. (*a*) Tu te in piſtrinum. *Plaut. Epid.* Act. 1. ſc. 2. Quid cauſæ eſt, quin hinc in piſtrinum rectâ proficiſcar viâ? Terent. Andr. Act. 3. ſc. 4.

(*b*) Quid ſuadet juveni lætus ſtridore catenæ? Juv. ſat. 14.

(*c*) Uritur ardenti duo propter lintea ferro. *Ibid.*

(*d*) Lipſ. de Cruce, cap. 10. Quid meritus? Crucem. *Ter. Andr.* Act. 3. ſc. 5.

and

and *Διχολομεῖν*, to Cleave them in two? What Reason cou'd there be, that *Crassus* should have had Ten or Twelve Thousand Persons thus perfectly at his Disposal? Was this for the Welfare and Happiness of Mankind? † Tamely to sit still, and see the Happiness of so large a Body of Men thus *entirely Ruin'd, and Sacrific'd to the irregular Will of one Man, seems a greater contradiction to the Will and Design of God, than any Opposition can be; For it is a tacit consent to the Ruin and Misery of Mankind.* This Naturally follows from Mr. *H*'s. way of arguing; and by this time he may see it reaches farther than, I believe, he ever design'd it should. Neither our Saviour nor his Apostles ever condemn'd a State of Slavery as intolerable in it self, or inconsistent with a Profession of Christiani-

---

* *Διχολομία, ἀναίρεσις*, Hesych. *And not only Dr.* Whitby *upon the Place, has learnedly shewn, this to be a usual sort of Death, in several other Cases; but our Blessed Lord applies it particularly to Slaves as a Punishment their incensed Masters had a Power of executing upon them, St.* Matt. 24. 51. *Where speaking of the disorderly Servant, who began* to quarrel with his Fellow-Servants, and to Eat and Drink with the Drunken, *he foretells that* the Lord of that Servant will come in a Day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and will cut him in sunder, and give him his Portion with the Hypocrites, *&c.*

† *Serm.* p. 8.

ty

ty, as I have obſerved; but plainly allow of it as lawful. Yet I cannot ſee how Mr. *H.* can prove it to be for the Benefit and Happineſs of Mankind; or how he can admit of the Lawfulneſs of it, if it be not.

If it be ſaid, theſe Slaves were the Purchaſe of their Owners, and ſo were their proper Goods, and there is therefore a great difference betwixt the caſe of ſuch, and that of Subjects, who * *generally ſpeaking, are not in a State of Captivity, never forfeited their Lives and Fortunes to their Prince; nor ever were bought with a price into their Arbitrary Power*; I grant it. But then I would ask, Is it for the Good of Mankind, that ſo great a part of them ſhould be thus enthrall'd, and oftentimes to very Cruel and Tyrannical Lords? Why then ſhould not theſe poor Enſlaved Perſons reſiſt their Inhumane Maſters, and violently ſhake off their Yoke, and ſet themſelves free? Why ſhould they not endeavour to releaſe themſelves of ſo diſagreeable a Service? Why ſhould they not raiſe another *Bellum Servile* in their own defence, whenſoever they find themſelves ſtrong enough, like that amongſt the *Ro-*

* *Vindication*, p. 129.

mans

mans mentioned † by *Florus*?. Why ſhould not they all joyn together to regain their loſt Liberty, and not Suffer themſelves to be Tyrannized over in ſo Mercileſs a manner? If they were bought, what right had they who ſold them, to make Merchandize of them? Was it for the good of Mankind that one part of them ſhould have ſuch Power over the other? Or if they were fairly and juſtly bought, and ſo their Services due to the Purchaſer; yet what right did this give the Purchaſer, to Tyrannize over them ſo exceſſively, as too commonly was done? The *Romans*, after the fatal Battle at *Cannæ*,* were forced to Arm no leſs than Eight Thouſand Slaves at once; and what Reaſon had theſe ever to lay down their Arms, and return to their Slavery? According to Mr. *H*'s Doctrine, it will be impoſſible to give a Reaſon, why they might not have combined together to caſt off their hard-hearted Maſters; who though they had purchaſed them to themſelves, ſtood obliged however to uſe them with Gentleneſs and Humanity! † *Tet tho' they abuſed them, beat them, Wounded, ay, and Killed them too, only for their own humour, I do not remember in Scripture*, ſays the Lord Biſhop of *Exon*,

† *L.* 3. *C.* 19. * Liv. *l.* 22, *c.* 57. † *Anſwer to Mr.* H's. *Letter, p. antepenult.*

and

and very truly, *any expreſs Allowance, much leſs Encouragement, given to Slaves to riſe up againſt, or ſtrike their Maſters, and much leſs to knock them on the Head for Publick Good*; i. e. *to releaſe themſelves and their Fellow-Servants from an unreaſonable and intolerable Servitude.* In ſhort, Slavery is certainly conſiſtent with a Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, and the Precepts of the Goſpel; tho' I cannot ſee how it is with the Doctrine of Mr. *H.*

3. This Doctrine of Mr. *H.* ſuits not with one Principal part of the Magiſtrate's Office, which is to defend his Subjects, as from the Invaſion of Foreigners, ſo likewiſe from the violence of their Fellow-Subjects, and the Wrongs and Injuries one might be apt to do to another. He is to take care to preſerve Peace, and execute Juſtice, by vindicating the Innocent and the Oppreſſed, and Puniſhing all ſorts of Malefactors. All which it will be out of his Power to do, if once his People come to riſe up againſt him, and either ſeize his Perſon and keep him in hold, or proceed Barbarouſly to take away his Life, as it befell Good K. *Charles* I. or elſe put him to Flight for his Safety, which was the Caſe of King *Charles* II. after *Worceſter-Fight.* Either of theſe ways the Prince is totally diſabled from giving that Protection which is due

from

from him to his trueſt and moſt faithful Subjects. And at a time too when they have moſt need of a Defender from the Outrages of their ill-affected Neighbours. For it is very rarely that a whole Nation joyn together to caſt off their Sovereign; but moſt uſually a conſiderable part adhere to him, and chooſe rather to risk their Fortunes with him, than break through all the ties both of their Natural and Sworn Allegiance. And then the Nation muſt be expected to become a meer *Aceldama*, a place of Blood and Slaughter, and of Rapine and Robbery, as was too ſadly viſible in in our own Land during the Reigns of the Three *Henry*'s, and again in the laſt Century betwixt Forty One, and Sixty; when the King could neither protect himſelf, nor the beſt of his Subjects, but ſome were Slain in Battle, others put to Death as Traytors, only for aſſiſting their Lawful Sovereign according to their bounden Duty of Allegiance; and the great Arch-biſhop *Laud*, tho' no way Guilty of Treaſon, was however Tried and Executed for it, * in defiance of the King's Pardon, ſent him in order to his better ſecurity; but which in thoſe miſerable Circumſtances, proved of no Advantage to him. So that this method

* *Ld.* Clarendon's *Hiſtory*: *B.* 8. *To.* 2. *p.* 442.

of

of Resistance must ordinarily be expected to rob, not only the Prince of his Power of Protecting his Subjects against each other, but a great part of the Subjects too, of their Quiet and Safety, their just Possessions, and, it may be, of their Lives. And whether this be not far worse than bearing with many instances of Tyranny from a Prince that really *does not attend continually to the end of his Institution,* or perhaps only with some Errors in one who is but suspected not to do it, I need not tell Mr. *H.* or any Man of Understanding. If he say, this is not always the effect of that Resistance he pleads for, neither do I say it is. It is enough for my purpose, and too much for him to Answer, that it is most commonly so, and very rarely happens otherwise, as all Histories testify. And this is a sufficient Indication, that Resistance, as it is an Ungodly, is likewise a very dangerous and destructive Remedy, and by no means adviseable to those who have any regard for the Welfare either of Soul or Body.

4. This Resistance Mr. *H. so Cautiously and prudently,* but in truth so Zealously and Vehemently contends for, is no less than a total Subversion of the Constitution. For by making the Prince accountable to the People, it Places the last Resort in Them, and so robs the Crown of its Supremacy,

and transfers it to the Subjects, as if the Prince were not God's Minister, but Theirs, to whom according to Mr. *H.* He is responsible for his Misgovernment; in direct opposition to the Laws and Frame of our Constitution, and particularly to all those Statutes that declare the King or Queen, to be the only Supreme Governor of these Realms, and that the Power of the *Militia* is solely in Him.

5. It is not only a Contradiction to our own Government, and the Laws of our Particular Country, but to Government in general, which is entirely supplanted by it, whilst it lasts, and possibly may never recover it self more. For Government, as Sir *Dudley Diggs* observes, * is the *effect not of a Peoples divided natural Powers, but as they are united and made one by Civil Constitution.* Which Union is again dissolv'd, whensoever the Subjects take upon them to oppose their Sovereign, and to act, as they always do in these Cases, not by any stated Laws, but by what themselves are pleas'd to call the Law of Necessity. So that their own Will and Power is their only Law, against which no Redress is to be had, either for their Sovereign, or their Fellow-subjects, any farther than themselves shall please.

* *Unlawfulness of a Subject's taking up Arms*, &c. p. 7.

This

This Principle, as the aforenamed Author ſpeaks, * *makes our Strifes and Debates endleſs, all our Laws would be writ in Blood; it breaks in ſunder all the Bonds, with which the goodly frame of Government is Knit together, and robs us of our Peace under Anarchy and Confuſion.* Thus the Conſtitution is ruin'd for the preſent. And tho' things do oftentimes recover at length their Ancient State, and run in their former Channels; yet that they ſhall do ſo, is more than any one can be ſure of, or than, I believe, Mr. *H.* with all his *Caution and Prudence*, will venture to undertake for. For tho' when once the Chief Actors in the Rebellion, are ſatiated with Blood and Rapine, they will find it neceſſary, in order to the preſervation of what they have poſſeſs'd themſelves of, and the eaſe and ſafety of their own Perſons, to fall again into ſome ſort of Government, yet into what ſort, it is as impoſſible to foretell, as it is to foreſee to what a degree their Fellow-ſubjects will Suffer by them. So that the People have no ſecurity that their Ancient Government ſhall ever be reſtored, when thus Unhing'd and Overthrown; nor do they know what, or when any other Settlement will ſucceed in lieu of it. Which is a matter of great impor-

* *P.* 32.

 tance,

tance, and deserves Mr. *H*'s most serious and deliberate Consideration, before he undertake to raise a Commotion, that for ought he knows, may have different effects from, perhaps quite contrary to what, he seems to promise himself from it.

6. Whereas Mr. *H.* maintains that* Governors are *placed in Authority* only in order to the *Publick Happiness of Mankind*; and that *if they use their Power to any other purpose, to the Hurt and Prejudice of Humane Society*, a Passive Non-resistance *would in these Cases appear, upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God than the contrary*; hence it necessarily follows, That he must either allow Men to live in a known Opposition, a highly Offensive, *a much greater Opposition to the Will of God*, or else according to him they must be bound to Resist in all instances, wherein the Prince *Deflects* from his Duty, or indeed wherein they but imagine him to do it. They must, I say, in all these instances be ready to resist, without staying till things come to extremity, as they would avoid the Guilt of this *much greater Opposition* to the Divine Will. Which is a Doctrine that not only contradicts his own Profession, that he is for no Resistance but where the Society

* *P.* 8.

is

is ruined without it; but beſides, if put in Practice, muſt inevitably ruine all the Societies in the World, muſt turn all into Anarchy and Confuſion, and many times purely upon groundleſs Fears and falſe Suggeſtions. Such a delicate Scheme has Mr. *H.* laid in order to the Happineſs of his Diſciples here in this World, beſides the *Damnation* that is threatned to them in the next.

7. And laſtly, This Doctrine of Mr. *H.* leaves but one ſort of Government in the World. All that have Written of Politics have owned, three different Species of Governments, Monarchy, Ariſtocracy, and Democracy; but if Mr. *H.* be in the Right, theſe have all been in the Wrong. For he reſolves the Chief Authority into the People, by directing the laſt Appeal to them; as who, according to him, have the Power of calling their Governors, whoſoever they be, to an account, and of depoſing them, and ſo diveſting them of all their Authority, whenſoever they ſhall think fit. Which makes the Government in reality a Democracy, or in *Ariſtotle*'s Phraſe, an Ochlocracy, whatſoever elſe it were deſign'd to have been, or by whatſoever Names it may be called.

All I deſign farther in this Preface, is only to remind Mr. *H.* of ſome Exceptions

that

that have formerly been made to his Doctrine; and ſtill call for an Anſwer from him. He makes a fair profeſſion of his Care to ſilence whatſoever had any way been urged againſt him; *I have not*, ſays he, * *eſteemed it for the Intereſt of Truth, or for the Advantage of the* Cauſe *I have eſpouſed*, to neglect any *thing that carries with it, any ſeeming Contradiction, either to the main Principle I defend, or to any Reaſoning by which I have defended it*; *whether* privately *or* publickly *advanced.* Yet tho' what has been *privately* Suggeſted, I cannot ſay; I am much Miſtaken, if ſeveral things have not been offered *publickly*, that have hitherto received either no Anſwer at all from him, or ſuch as does by no means come up to the Point. Amongſt the former of which I reckon theſe:

1. † *It is the Will of God, Men ſhould uſe the* Riches *and* Honour *he gives them, for the good of Mankind*; *but does it follow that a Wicked Man forfeits his Eſtate and Title, becauſe he abuſes them?* Namely, by not doing that good with them which he ought, Poſſibly ſometimes by doing the greater Miſchief to his Neighbours; But more uſually by indulging himſelf in Looſneſs and Debauchery, to the Diſhonour of Almigh-

* *Pref.* p. 4. † *Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject.* p. 12.

ty

ty God, and the Ruine of himſelf, both Soul and Body. Every one knows this is no Cauſe of Forfeiture, any otherwiſe than as he may in ſome Caſes incurr Legal Penalties. Let him but keep from this, and he may ſpend his Days in Riot, and Exceſs, and groſs Uncharitableneſs, without loſing his Right and Title to his Eſtate, whilſt it is not ſpent or ſold. Why then ſhould my Prince's Miſgovernment forfeit his Title to his Dominions? To this Mr. *H.* has not ſaid a Word that I could obſerve.

2. * *Nebuchadnezzar was a proud and wicked King*, and a great *Oppreſſor of God's People*; *and yet he calls him his* Servant, *and Commands the* Jews, *and other* Nations, *to ſubmit to his Yoke.* This was alledged to prove that *Wicked Princes do not ceaſe to be God's Miniſters.* But without any Reply that I can find.

3. Again ſays the ſame Author, † *If the Apoſtle at firſt preſſes Obedience and Non-reſiſtance in* unlimited Words, *for Faſhion ſake*, and yet afterwards *limits it in ſuch a manner, as that the Rulers in whoſe Reign he wrote, and their Succeſſors for above Two Hundred years afterwards, could take no Benefit by it; for what did it ſerve but to delude them? Whilſt he delivers his Precepts with an Am-*

* Ibid. † *P.* 13.

bigotity befitting the Oracle at Delphos, *but not at all agreeable to the Majesty and Simplicity of the Oracles of God.* Of this likewise Mr. *H.* takes no notice.

4. Thus also speaks another Author, * *Suppose a Justice of Peace should send an Innocent Man to Prison, or a Constable set a Man in the Stocks that was quietly walking along the Streets; and suppose them Guilty of numerous repeated Acts of this Nature, to the disturbance of the Publick Peace, yet it is plain their Office does not determine thereupon. The one is still a* Justice, *the other a* Constable, *and tho' they, in the Execution of their Office, act against Law, yet they are Magistrates by* Law, *and are invested with the* King's *Authority. Even so when a bad Prince takes unwarrantable Measures, contrary to the true Interest and Happiness of his People, and by so doing betrays his Trust, and goes directly opposite to the* Law of God, *he is notwithstanding* the Minister of God, *and such a one too, for all Mr.* H. *to whom St.* Paul *in this Chapter enjoyns the People to submit,* **not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake.** Which was so pat an Illustration, that one would have thought Mr. *H.* could not well overlook it; but however he has thought fit to say nothing to it.

Of the latter, I shall give only this single Instance. † It was objected, that to make

* *St.* Paul *no mover of Sedition*, p. 7. † *Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject.* p. 2. Mis-

Miſmanagement a forfeiture of the Supreme Government, it was neceſſary, that God ſhould have ſomewhere declar'd ſuch Abuſe of the Power to be a forfeiture of it; and that upon ſuch forfeiture it eſcheats to the People. And to confirm this laſt condition, it follows, *For you know that tho' a Man has forfeited his Life, yet if any one takes the forfeiture without lawful Authority, he is a Murderer both by the Law of God, and the Law of the Land.* And to the ſame purpoſe, † *Thou ſhalt not kill, is one general Rule for the Publick Good: But if a Man is ever ſo ill an Inſtrument, or Miſchievous to the Publick, this Commandment may not therefore be broken to get rid of him, on pretence that the Breach in this Caſe, better ſerves the Publick, than the keeping thereof doth.* The plain meaning of both which Authors is, that how juſtly ſoever a Malefactor has forfeited his Life, none but the Magiſtrate can take it from him; and if any do it without his appointment, he is a Murderer, not only in the Sight of God, but in the Senſe of the Law. Now to the Objection Mr. *H.* has ſaid nothing that I obſerve. To the Reaſon for enforcing it he has offered at a Reply; but which is as good as none. * *We know*, ſays he, *and ſee, that it hath been allowed in all* Governments, *to get* rid *of ſuch Men by putting 'em to Death.*

† *Plea for the Publick Good*, p. 6. * *Pref.* p. 14.

Which

Which is no more than what the Objectors themselves suppose. But how is this to be done? By none but the Magistrate, say they. *The Magistrate is to do it*, says Mr. *H.* But as to the Plea that a Private Man may not do it, though to deliver the Publick from such a Corrupt and Destructive Member; to this he says not one Word. He argues that the Magistrate's Executing Offenders is no breach of the General Rule, *Thou shalt not kill*; and pleads for self-defence against any that shall unjustly Assault my Life; but not a Word of the Power, of Publick Good to warrant the taking away a Criminal's Life by a Private Hand. Though this was the only point he was concerned to speak to. Yet if Publick Good will not warrant the taking away such an unsound and dangerous Member any other way, than as the Law directs, it is strange to think that it should Authorize the expelling or Murdering the Supreme Governor, against the Laws both of God and Man.

The Reader is desired to take Notice, that my References to Mr. H's. Measures of Submission, *are Paged according to his First Edition, except only in the Preface; and that if sometimes I mention the King only, (as he oftentimes does) I would be understood to mean however* either King or Queen.

THE CONTENTS.

The INTRODUCTION.

SHewing the Design of Mr. H's. *Sermon, and its Vindication, and of this Answer to them,* Page 1. *As also how well Mr.* H's. *Doctrine agrees with that of St.* Paul, p. 3. *And the Method of the ensuing Answer,* p. 6.

PART I.

Containing a Disproof of Mr. H's. *Argument, for Resistance,* p. 7. *Where the Reader may see the several Propositions he undertakes to maintain,* p. 9.

CHAP. I.

Whether bare Possession of the Throne gives a Right to the Subjects Allegiance, p. 10. *Mr.* H's. *first Position,* ibid. *Which is proved Unreasonable,* p. 12. *Unjust,* p. 13. *Subversive of our English Constitution,* p. 17. *And contrary to the Holy Scripture,* p. 21. *Some Objections Answer'd,* p. 23.

CHAP. II.

Whether a bad Governor cannot be that Minister, to whom St. Paul *requires Submission and Obedience?* p. 31. *Mr.* H's *Second Position,* ibid. *Wherein he contradicts St.* Augustin *and others of the Fathers;* p. 32. *And the Doctrine of the Scriptures,* p. 33. *Some Objections considered,* p. 37.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Whether the Higher Powers are from God, only so far as they act agreeably to his Will, and study to promote the Happiness of Humane Society? p. 46. *Mr.* H's. *Third Position*, ibid. *Disproved from the Instance of Husband and Wife*, p. 47. *Of Masters and Servants*, p. 49. *Of a General, a Judge, and a Mayor*, p. 51. *Of a Minister of the Gospel*, p. 52. *And of a Viceroy*, p. 53. *An Objection from the end of Government considered*, p. 54. *Another from* Nero, p. 55. *Another from our Saviour calling* Herod *Fox, and St.* Paul's *saying he was deliver'd out of the Mouth of the Lion*, p. 57. *And another from* David's *carriage towards* Saul, ibid. *The Doctrine of one of our Homilies in this respect*, p. 64.

CHAP. IV.

Whether it be not only Innocent, but Honourable and Glorious, to rise up against a Prince, that attends not to the End of his Government, p. 67. *Mr.* H's. *Fourth Position answered*, ibid.

CHAP. V.

Whether the Peace and Happiness of Mankind be the Sole end of Government? p. 70. *Mr.* H's. *last Position; against which is shewn First, That the Publick Peace and Happiness of Mankind is not the sole end of Government*, ibid. *For another is, To Represent God Almighty to the People*, p. 70. *And another, To take care of God's Worship and Service*, p. 74. *And yet if it were, this would not prove the Lawfulness of Resisting the Higher Powers*, p. 76. *The Plea of Publick Good debated*, p. 79.

CHAP.

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. VI.

Whether Mr. H. *has been so Prudent and Cautious in Preaching this Doctrine, as he professes himself to have been?* p. 91. *Whether he has been as cautious as the Apostle St.* Paul *was?* ibid. *Mr.* H. *owns a remarkable difference betwixt the Apostle's Words and his Explication of them,* p. 100. *He lays before the Reader the Words in which he has expressed his own Sense,* 106.

CHAP. VII.

Whether Mr. H. *has faithfully expounded the Words of the Apostle,* Rom. 13. 1, &c. p. 113. *Some Observations upon Mr.* H's. *Exposition,* p. 115. *Another Exposition in lieu of his,* p. 119.

CHAP. VIII.

Whether Mr. H's. *several Arguments do sufficiently disprove the Doctrine of Non-Resistance,* p. 124. *First from* Nero, *and the* Roman *Emperors,* ibid. *Then from the* Jews, p. 127. *And from those who acknowledged no Submission due to Governors in point of Conscience,* p. 128. *From the Jews again,* ibid. *From the* Romans, ibid. *From the Happiness of Humane Society,* p. 130. *From the Reasoning of St.* Paul, Rom. 13. p. 131. *From the Restrictions necessarily to be allowed in divers places of Scripture,* ibid. *And particularly with respect to the Case of Private Injurious Persons,* p. 134. *From the Limitation of Active Obedience,* p. 139. *From the Authority of the Lowest Magistrate,* p. 140. *From St.* Paul's *Behaviour towards the Magistrates at* Philippi, p. 141. *And his not appealing to* Rom. 13. *for his own Vindication,* ibid. *And lastly from St.* Paul's *method of procedure in this Chapter,* p. 142. *The Conclusion of this First Part,* p. 145.

ERRATA.

ERRATA in the first Part.

PAge 14. l. 34. for *a* r. *and*. l. 38. for c. 7. r. *Reports*. l. 7. p. 15. l. 11. for *that* r. *the*. p. 16. l. 6. r. *and all*. p. 19. l. 18. r. *Ed. III*. p. 32. l. 10. r. *Vespasians*. p. 43. l. 30. d. *an*. p. 46. r. *Chap. III*. p. 47. l. 28. r. *impietates*. p. 56. l. 29. r. *Neronis 2do. Origenes*. p. 62. l. 4. d. *of*. p. 67. l. 37. r. *unusual*. p. 71. l. 34. r. * *Beza*. l. 38. for *many*, r. *any*. p. 72. l. 26. r. *Words run*. p. 71 l. 21. r. *Parliament is* p. 73. l. 14. r. *choose*. p. 75. p. 12. r. *Image*. p. 78. l. 13. r. *Council*. p. 82. l. 9. for *be* r. *were*. p. 83. l. 19. for *is*, r. *in*. p. 86. l. 38. for *hasty*, r. *happy*. p. 90. l. 22. for *well*, r. *evil*. p. 91. r. *Chap. VI*. p. 93. l. 7. r. *lies*. p. 113. l. 21. for *that*, r. *than*. p. 116. l. 13. r. *justify*. p. 133. l. ult. r. ἠκησιῶμεν. p. 140. l. 11. r. *inferring*. p. 142. l. 20. r. *yet*.

Mr. *HOADLY's*

MEASURES of SUBMISSION

Enquired into, and Disprov'd.

The INTRODUCTION.

MR. *Hoadly*, having had sufficient Time to reflect upon the Intemperance and Indecency of his *Preface*, especially as coming from a great Pretender to Calmness and Moderation; I am willing to hope he has seriously consider'd it, and repented of it: And the rather, because of his having left it out of the second Edition of his Book. And for this Reason I shall pass it over; tho' some perhaps will think he ought not only to have laid it aside, but to have made some Acknowledgment of the Indignity offer'd in it, to a very venerable Body of Men.

As also I shall take the less Notice of the Sermon, because the Sum and Purport of it is more fully contained, in the Vindication I am now to examine.

The principal, I may say, the only Design of which, as well as of the Sermon, being to palliate, justify, and recommend the great Sin of *Resisting the higher Powers*, whenever they shall prove to be such as the Apostle, in the Text, more particularly required to *be subject to*, such I mean, as the *Roman* Emperors about that Time were: I shall therefore apply my self to shew the Inconsistency of Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine with the Apostle's, and the terrible Danger to which those expose themselves, who are unfortunately ensnared by it.

And in truth, it is no light Charge I have against this unchristian Doctrine, but such as is weighty and home, and would be thought abundantly sufficient in any other Case: For, 'tis a Doctrine that has both Divine and Humane Testimony against it, and I might add, the Dictates of right Reason too, but that I design to be very sparing in this respect, to keep within the Limits of my own Profession, and to such Arguments as Religion suggests, together with what the Laws of the Land enjoin, a Submission to which in all things lawful, is certainly taught by our Religion, and which are therefore the proper Boundaries of our Loyalty and Obedience. These Mr. *H.* cannot deny to be expressly against him, and * is forced therefore to fly to the Shelter of I know not what *old Laws*; nor is he pleased to tell us what they are. Only it seems somebody has *told him, that in our Law*, (that is to say, in *Bracton*, l. 3. c. 9. *de legibus, & consuetudinibus Angliæ*,) *the King is declared to be the* Minister *of* God, *only as he performs the positive Will of God, by doing all manner of good Services to his People*; *and that when he attempts their Ruin, and declines to Injustice and Oppression, he becomes the* Minister *of the* Devil. A rare hearsay-Story to be set up in Confutation of our positive known Statutes! which are so expressly against him, that he dares not so much as mention any of them; but instead of them, pretends to have heard,

* *Vindication*, p. 212, 213, 214.

tho'

tho' we muſt not know from whom, *of an old Law* of his Side; tho' where this *old Law* is to be found, ſince *Bracton* had no Power of making Laws, is as difficult to diſcover, as who the Perſon was that told him of it. But no matter for that, *he has been told it*, and that muſt be thought enough to overbear all the Authority of the Statute-book to the contrary; which is juſt the ſame wiſe way of arguing, as if a *Papiſt* being urged with the Second Commandment, againſt the worſhipping of Images, ſhould return for anſwer, that he did not well underſtand theſe Commandments, but he had been told by a certain devout Man, that there was an older Commandment for the Worſhip of them. The Argument is exactly parallel, and yet I am pretty confident, Mr. *H.* would not allow of this as a good Plea; but would condemn it, on the contrary, as one of the weakeſt that ever was uſed.

At this rate Mr. *H.* may preach rebellious Sermons, and print as many Vindications of them as he pleaſes, and plead the Laws of Nature, and other old unknown Laws on his Side, as long as he thinks good; yet ſo long as the Laws of the Land are poſitively againſt him, a good Subject would think himſelf obliged to give very little heed to him, tho' theſe Laws were only not contradictory to the Law of God.

But if they moreover, have the Goſpel of their ſide, and not only do not contradict, but on the contrary are intended to enforce the Obſervation of its Injunctions, by making that Diſobedience ſeverely puniſhable here, which the Apoſtle declares to be eternally puniſhable hereafter, How ill muſt it become a Preacher of Chriſtianity to ſet up his antiſcriptural, unknown *old Laws*, in Defiance to our later Statutes, as well as the ancienter Doctrines of the Law, well known and well agreeing with the Precepts of the Goſpel?

The Apoſtle requires, that we * *put People in mind to be ſubject to Principalities and Powers, and to*

* *Tit.* 3. 1.

obey Magistrates. And Mr. *H.* would have done much better to have followed this Apostolical Canon, and taught his Hearers and Readers what Submission God requires of them, to their Sovereign, than to instill such Principles into them, as necessarily tend to the Subversion of all Government, which can never be safe, where such anti-monarchical and treasonable Notions prevail.

Mr. *H.* must needs own that *Tiberius* was the *Higher Power* at *Rome*, when our blessed Saviour was crucified, and *Claudius* and *Nero* when the Apostles wrote their Epistles. He must own likewise, that these were not such excellent Governors, as to whom alone he pleads Obedience to be due. He must own farther, that one of these was certainly the *Power* then *in Being*, when the Epistle to the *Romans* was written. And then I would be glad to learn of him how his Doctrine and St. *Paul*'s can possibly be reconciled. St. *Paul* * teaches, that the *Powers* that then were, *were ordained of God*, and consequently his Vicegerents. Mr. *Hoadly* affirms on the contrary, † that if Princes *use their Power to the Hurt and Prejudice of human Society*, which very few have ever done more than these, *they cannot be called God's Vicegerents, without the highest Profaneſs.*

Again, ‖ *Whosoever resisteth the Power*, even in the Time of those wicked Emperors; for it is not whosoever shall at any Time hereafter, when there may happen to be a good Prince, but even now, under such as then were, in the present Tense; *Whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God*, is St. *Paul*'s Doctrine. But this will not go down with Mr. *H.* and therefore he tells us, that * *to oppose them* (who seek the Hurt of human Society, to *oppose them in such Cases*) *cannot be to oppose the Authority of God:* Nay, a passive Non-resistance *would appear, upon Examination*, to be *a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.*

---

* *Rom.* 13. 1. † *p.* 8. ‖ *v.* 2. * *Ibid.*

Once

Once more, v. 5. *Ye must needs be subject*, says the Apostle, *not only for Wrath*, or out of fear of being punished by the Magistrate, *but also for Conscience Sake*, that is, out of regard to Almighty God, who has required it at your Hands, and will be sure (as is declared at the Second Verse of that Chapter) to punish the Neglect of it with everlasting *Damnation* in the other World. But to this Mr. *Hoadly* has a *Reply* ready at hand, namely * *That there is an indispensable Duty upon all*, Subjects *as well as* others, *to regard the publick Interest*; *and if their Submission help to destroy and ruin That*, *their Submission cannot be a Virtue.*

Thus we see how admirably Mr. *H.* observes the Apostle's Exhortation, † *to be a follower of him*, *as he also was of Christ*; how faithfully he recommends the same Doctrine to his Admirers, that St. *Paul* taught the *Romans*; and how likely they are to approve themselves good Christians, by forsaking the Apostle, to follow him; there being nothing more plain, than that the one as positively enjoins a Passive, Submissive Non-resistance, even to tyrannical oppressive Princes, to a *Claudius*, or a *Nero*; as the other decries and condemns it, and would confine our Obedience, ‖ only to *such Governors as answer the good End of their Institution*, by making it their continual Study to promote the publick Welfare.

Which gives just Cause to wonder how this Book has been suffer'd to go on triumphantly so long together, for want of an Answer; and the Author and his Partizans so highly to value themselves upon it, as if it were unanswerable. Whereas, from what is already said, it is obvious to observe how easie a thing it must be to answer it; in as much as if the Varnish and Flourishes be but once taken off from it, it plainly appears to be only the old Doctrine of the Covenanters and Regicides in King *Charles* the Martyr's

* *P.* 10. † 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. ‖ *P.* 7.

Days, new vampt, and ſet forth in a more modiſh Dreſs.

This therefore is the Province I have undertaken: And in the Diſcharge of it, I hope to make it evident beyond Contradiction, that this Doctrine of forcibly reſiſting our Lawful Sovereign, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the Writings of the primitive Chriſtians, to the Doctrines of our own Church, and the expreſs Declarations of Multitudes of its moſt eminent Divines, ever ſince the Reformation, Archbiſhops, Biſhops, and others, to our Law-Books and Statutes; and in ſhort, to the Laws both of God and the Land. And that I may proceed herein the more regularly, and to the better Satisfaction of the Reader, I ſhall divide what I have to offer into theſe two Parts.

I. To ſhew that Mr. *H.* has not proved the Truth of his Doctrine of Reſiſtance.

II. To evince on the other hand, the Groundleſsneſs and Falſity of it.

PART

PART I.

FIRST I am to shew that Mr. *Hoadly has not proved the Doctrine of Resistance.* He tells us, *what* * *St.* Paul *has deliver'd in this* Chapter, † *concerning the* Duty of Subjects, *is not barely by way of* Precept, *or* Command, *only, as he hath done in many other Cases; but by way of reasoning, or inforcing one thing from another, which will help mightily to secure the true Sense of the Place. So that in order to prove that I have mistaken, or misrepresented St.* Paul, *it will not be sufficient to say that he condemns* Resistance, *and presseth* Subjection, (*for SO*, says he, *DO I LIKEWISE:*) *but it must be shewn that his Reasoning concludes against* the Resistance, *WHICH I HAVE TAUGHT TO BE LAWFUL; and necessarily infers such a* Passive Submission, *as I have denied to follow from it; and that this Passage is of that peculiar Nature, that it can admit of no Restrictions, tho' numberless other Passages of the* New Testament *necessarily require them.*

Here Mr. *H.* assures us, that he himself *condemns Resistance, and presses Subjection, as St.* Paul *does.* Tho' if he had set himself to preach directly against his own Text, he could not well have preached otherwise than he has done. St. *Paul* is as express as may be against Resistance: But Mr. *Hoadly*, that he may contradict himself, as well as his Text, tells us in the same Breath, that *he has taught Resistance to be lawful.* An excellent Method certainly, *of condemning Resistance, and pressing Subjection*, by teaching that 'tis *lawful to*

* *P.* 63. 64. † *Rom.* 13.

Resist. This is Mr. *H*'s manner of Doctrine; but he will never be able to perswade the World it is St. *Paul*'s.

On the contrary, St. *Paul*, as he justly observes, not only delivers himself in the Words under Consideration, *by way of Precept or Command*, but by way of *Reasoning, or inferring one thing from another:* He not only requires *every Soul to be subject to the Higher Powers*, but enforces this Command from the Original of Authority, in that *there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be are ordained of God*; by denouncing eternal Vengeance to such as Resist, assuring them that they *shall receive to themselves Damnation*; and again, by representing the Usefulness of Government, the Benefits whereof are yet a farther Obligation to ready Submission to Governors, inasmuch as *Rulers are not a terror to good Works, but to the evil.* Thus powerfully does the Apostle press this Duty of Obedience and Submission upon all Subjects, which one would have thought should have been Warning enough to Mr. *H.* not to *teach the Lawfulness of Resistance.*

And this Consideration is moreover a sufficient Argument to prove that *these Words will admit of no Restriction, tho' numberless others may*, namely because the Apostle's Reasoning is directly against it, and there is nothing in any other Part of Scripture to restrain them, as there is for abundance of other general Expressions.

Thus much in general concerning Mr. *H*'s. Method of handling these Words, and the Inconsistency of his Doctrine with the Apostle's. But it will be requisite, in order to a fuller Detection of his Errors, to follow him thro' the several extravagant Propositions, he undertakes to maintain in his own Vindication: Which, to avoid mistake, I shall first lay down in his own Words, and then shall proceed to an impartial Consideration of them. They are these Five:

I. *The*

I. *The Apostle meant this* [the Subjection due to the higher Powers] † *of all Sorts of supream Powers; and that* there is no Power but of God, *certainly extends equally to all who are possess'd of any sort of Power, to be exercised for the Good of the Publick.*

II. * *That Governor who is not a terror to Evil Works, but to Good; who is not the Minister of Good to the Virtuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only; and who is not continually watching for the Good and Happiness of Humane Society, is not the Governor whom St.* Paul *meant in this Place, or to whom he here presses Obedience.*

III. † *These Higher Powers are from God, as they act agreeably to his Will, which is, that they should promote the Happiness and Good of Humane Society, which St.* Paul *all along supposes them to do. And consequently when they do the contrary, they cannot be said to be from God, or to act by his Authority, any more than an Inferiour Magistrate may be said to act by a Prince's Authority, whilst he acts directly contrary to his Will.*

IV. ‡ *Though the Authority of a Prince, in carrying forward the end of his Power, cannot be resisted without the Highest Guilt; yet his Power in acting contrary to that end, may be opposed without the shadow of a Crime; nay, with Honour and Glory.* This he tells us afterwards, * *is the Principal Doctrine contain'd in his Sermon,* and it plainly appears to be what he chiefly aimed at Establishing, That *supposing it true, that Governours act contrary to the end of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Public, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governours.*

V. And lastly, ‖ *The Public Peace and Happiness of Mankind is the Sole end of Government, as well if it be appointed by God himself, as if it be purely of Humane Institution;* and again in other Terms,

† P. 18. * P. 21. † P. 24. ‡ P. 31. * P. 40. ‖ P. 32.

Sub-

* *Submission is due to Governors, not for their own sake, but meerly for the sake of the Public Happiness.*

These Principles Mr. *H.* lays down, and though he owns them † *to have given offence*, (as they very justly might) he however undertakes the Defence of them. And to let the Reader see how successfully he has performed this undertaking, I now apply my self to enquire into the Truth of them. Which having done, I shall proceed to what else falls under this First Part of my Task.

CHAP. I.

Whether bare Possession of the Throne gives a Right to the Subject's Allegiance?

THe first Position here laid down is, *That the Subjection which St.* Paul *requires to be paid to the Higher Powers, he requires to be paid to all sorts of them*; and that these Words, *There is no Power but of God*, extend equally to all who are got into a Throne. For so his words are, as I cited them before; ‡ *The Apostle meant this* [the Subjection due to the Higher Powers] *of all sorts of Supreme Powers, and* that there is no Power but of God, *certainly extends equally to all who are possess'd of any sort of Power, to be exercis'd for the good of the Public.* This says Mr. *H.* is certain. And yet it is much more certain, that this Notion has been abundantly confuted, ‖ in Divers Treatises during the long Rebellion: And since that, in * two very Judicious and Learned Discourses, written purposely upon this very Subject; not to mention

---

* *Ibid.* † P. 33. ‡ P. 8. ‖ *Sanderson us de Obligatione Conscientiæ; præcipuè verò prælect.* 5. *n.* 12, *&* 15. *Plea for the Nonsubscribers*, Printed in the year 1650. *The Exercitation concerning Usurped Powers*, Printed in the same year. * *Case of Allegiance to a King in Possession, with the Vindication.* seve-

several other ‡ excellent Tracts to the same purpose. So that Mr. *H.* ought in all Reason, to have tried first how he could Answer these, before he took upon him to flourish with this Doctrine, as if it had never been put to Silence.

Some acts of Obedience may be perform'd under an Usurper, such as the Defence of one's Country against the Invasion of Foreign Enemies, the Promotion of Trade, and the Administration of Justice betwixt Man and Man. And some Learned Men have thought, the Punishment of Malefactors, (though I know others of great Note, have question'd the Lawfulness of Executing Criminals under an Usurpation. And * it is observ'd of Sir *Matthew Hale* in particular, that when a Judge under *Cromwell*, he yet refus'd to sit on the Crown-side to Try those Accus'd of Felony or Treason, as not reckoning any Commission but the King's sufficient to bear him out in so doing.) These, and such as these, the Safety and Welfare of the Society whereto we belong requires of its Members, though it should happen to be under a King who were so only in Fact. As has been observ'd by the Excellent Bishop *Sanderson* in his admirable Discourse, † *de Obligatione Conscientiæ.* And a Man may so far consult his Country's Good, and lend his Assistance for promoting it with a safe Conscience. But ‡ the Case is very different when an Intruder claims all the Duty and Allegiance that belongs, and ought therefore to be paid

‡ Kettlewell's *Duty of Allegiance settled upon its true Grounds. The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examin'd.* Answer to a late Pamphlet Intituled *Obedience and Submission*, &c. *And an Answer to the Vindication of it. An Examination of the Arguments, drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr.* Sherlock's *Case of Allegiance, and its Vindication.. Dr.* Sherlock's *Case of Allegiance Consider'd.*

* *Bishop* Burnet's *Life of Sir* Matthew Hale, *p.* 24.

† *Prælect.* 5. *n.* 19. ‡ Proinde Regni Invasori sic præstandum est obsequium, ut fidelitas legitimo Principi debita nullatenus violetur, nec quidquam fiat in juris sui præjudicium. *R. Sanderſonus* de Obligat. Conscientiæ, Præl. 5. n. 20.

only

only to a Rightful Sovereign. And yet it is no leſs than this that Mr. *H.* would have laid in common, as due to every one that has Power enough to demand it, provided they do not employ their Power to the Ruine of thoſe over whomthey have ſet themſelves. Wherefore of this Principle of his I deſire it may be obſerv'd, that,

1. It is Unreaſonable, and would be a great Encouragement to attempts upon the Sovereignty, to the great Diſturbance and Damage of the Subjects, as well as of the Sovereign. It would make the State of Princes very Precarious and Uncertain, when it was once generally believed, that if any one of Intereſt and Deſign could but contrive to diſplace them and get into their Room, he were in no wiſe to be accountable for his ill Uſage of them, but the whole People were bound to aſſiſt him againſt them. And by occaſioning frequent Inſurrections it muſt be highly prejudicial alſo to the Subjects, a great part of whom are uſually great ſufferers upon a Revolution, and ſo much the greater, by how much the longer it is in bringing about.

And, though when the Invader is once ſettled, it may prove of uſe to thoſe who are ready enough in turning upon every change of Government, it has not been thought for their Reputation, nor any Commendation of their Honeſty, thus to behave themſelves upon every Change. This, ſays a great Man, * *is a fine plyable Principle as a Man could wiſh, 'twill lap about your Finger like* Barbary-*Gold. Thus when King* Charles *the Firſt of Bleſſed Memory, had that Power in his Hands, this was an extraordinary Providence, and the Right of Government was in Him. But ſtay, it may be the Doctor had not ſtudied the point himſelf ſo ſoon. But to be ſure when the Parliament got the better, that was an* extraordinary

* *Bp.* Grove's *Vindication of the Conforming Clergy, in Anſwer to Mr.* Jenkins, *p.* 16.

Pro-

Providence *indeed, and then, without doubt, they were the Supreme Authority, as their* Petitioner *Stiles them*; *and so was* Oliver Cromwell, *and so was* Richard, *and so was* the Rump, *and so was* the Committee of Safety, *and so was I know not who, and so round, untill his Majesty's most Happy Restoration*; *and then because there was an* extraordinary Providence *in that, so is He too*; *and so Mr.* Jenkyn *is as good a Subject as can be desired, and so he had been whoever had come.* And so would Mr. *Hoadly* if he had liv'd in those times; and according to his Principles must have condemned all those Brave Men as Traytors aud Rebels, who were so little instructed in his Divinity as to lose all they had, and many of them their Dearest Lives, for the sake of their Lawful Sovereign. Such versatile Subjects as these are but a broken Staff, or Reed, like *Egypt, on which*, says the Prophet, * *if a Man lean, it will go into his hand and pierce it.* Their Prince can Repose no manner of Trust in them; he is sure they will Deceive him, whensoever they find his Case to be such, that they can expect to do it to Advantage, that is to say, when he has most need of their Assistance.

2. Such a transferring our Allegiance is highly unjust towards our Natural Sovereign, to whom alone it of Right belongs. It is no less than a Robbing him of a due, that both † our Saviour, and his ‡ Apostle St. *Paul* require to be rendered him by all his Subjects. And it is making our selves Parties to the Usurpation, by giving up our Allegiance to the Usurper, and thereby engaging to assist him in his Unjust Possession. And so should we become Guilty, if not of a Forcible Entry, yet of an Unjust Detaining what is another's Right; and seeing Justice is owing at least as much to Sovereign Princes as to lesser Persons, our Guilt in this Case, must be of a very heinous Nature, especially if we had been such as besides our Natural Allegiance, had sworn *Fidelity to*

* *Isa.* 36. 6. † *St.* Matt. 22. 21. ‡ *Rom.* 13. 7.

them

them and their Heirs, and Lawful Succeſſors, and ſo cannot diſpoſe of our Allegiance from them, without breach of Oath, added to our other Injuſtice towards them.

Beſides, there is no Perſon ſo Great, or in ſo High a Station, as not to be oblig'd by the Common Laws of God, and the Law of Nature, no leſs than the Meaneſt Subject, and ſo all are neceſſarily tied to make Reſtitution of whatſoever is unjuſtly withheld from its true Proprietor. And to ſay that Allegiance is due to thoſe who are thus bound, as they either fear God, or love their own Souls, to Surrender the Power they have no Right to; to ſay that Allegiance is due to them, and * by conſequence that they are to be aſſiſted by all means in our Power, even with the hazard, it may be the loſs of our Lives, is to ſay, that the whole Nation are oblig'd to involve themſelves in the ſame Crime, and ſo to partake both of their Guilt here, and their Puniſhment hereafter. And whether the utmoſt Temporal Advantage can compenſate for this, our Bleſſed Saviour has determined beyond Contradiction or Diſpute; St. *Matthew* 16. 26. *What ſhall it profit a Man, if he ſhall gain the whole World, and loſe his own Soul? or what ſhall a man give in exchange for his Soul?*

So that upon both theſe accounts, it is manifeſtly againſt the Rules of Juſtice, to ſuppoſe that bare Poſſeſſion, without Right, ſhould give a Title to the Subjects Allegiance. And it is therefore in no wiſe to be imagin'd that St. *Paul* would require the Subjects Obedience to be paid to the Invaders of Power and Government, as Mr. *H.* teaches it ought to be. No, the Apoſtle underſtood his Office better, than

* Ligantia eſt ex quâ Domino tenentur Vaſſalli ſui contra omnes homines qui mori poſſunt & vivere, proprii corporis præbere conſilii & auxilii juvamentum, —— nec ei adverſantium partem in aliquo confovere. Cowel's *Interpreter in the Word* Ligeancie. *And ſo ſays the Lord Ch. J.* Coke; *Ligeance is true and Faithful Obedience of the Subject due to the Sovereign.* Reports, P. 7. p. 4.

to

to Preach up Injuſtice, and direct his Readers to pay their Allegiance where it was not due. He order'd it to be paid to ſuch Governors as were *ordain'd of God*, not to any that could Dethrone them, and get into their Place, tho' by ever ſo Unreaſonable and Wicked Means.

He knew very well that an Unjuſt Action could never create a Right where there was none before. It may in ſome Caſes help to it, may make that a certain and preſent Right, which was but future and contingent, by removing the Impediments that were in the way to it. As when an Invader, who had a remote Title to a Throne, violently thruſts himſelf into it before his time, by the Slaughter of all that ſtood between Him and It. Which had been the Caſe of *Richard* III, had his Niece by his Means, undergone the ſame Fate with her Two Brothers. But this method of proceeding can never create a new Right, where there is no other ground for it.

If it could, this would make it utterly unlawful for an oppreſſed Prince to endeavour the Recovery of his loſt Crown, tho' his Title to it were ever ſo clear. And ſo it would condemn * *David*'s attempt to regain his Kingdom from *his undutiful Son* Abſalom, after he had been Two years King *de Facto*, and † *Jehoiada*'s dethroning *Athaliah* in order to the Reſtauration of his Lawful Sovereign *Joaſh*, whoſe Authority ſhe had Traiterouſly and Wickedly taken upon her to Execute. And which it concerns Mr *H.* more particularly to conſider; after all his profeſſions of Loyalty and Zeal for Queen *ANN*, if Her Majeſty ſhould ever come to be any way Diſpoſſeſs'd of the Throne of *Great Britain*, and another though ever ſo wrongfully got into it, it would, according to his Doctrine, be Unlawful and Damnable to make the leaſt Step towards Her Recovery of it; and all thoſe muſt needs be Rebels, that ſhould dare to ſide with Her Majeſty claiming againſt the Intruder in Poſ-

* 2 *Sam.* 15, *&c.* † 2 *Kings* 11. 12.

ſeſſion

session. Such an Excellent Subject is Mr. *H.* and such are all those sure to be that follow his Doctrine in this Point.

And here it deserves further to be considered, that tho' the Sovereign be, under God, * the Fountain of all Power, and all the Laws when tendered by the Two Houses, are enacted by him or her, and are afterwards executed by the same Authority; yet this Doctrine of Mr. *H.* leaves the Sovereign, whether King, or Queen, in a far worse condition in this respect than any of the Subjects. For no Subject loses his Inheritance by another's wresting it out of his Hands, so long as he is able to prove his Right to it; but so soon as ever he has made out his Claim, the Laws order, and it is accordingly the Magistrate's business to provide that he be restor'd to it, with all its Priviledges and Emoluments, together with Costs of Suit for the Charges he has been at in the Recovery of it. But if the King or Queen lose the Crown, there is no help in this Case, all the Subjects are immediately bound to turn Enemies, and venture their Lives and all they have to keep out their *Rightful* Sovereign, tho' ever so well convinced of the Justice of the Claim. As if Justice were owing to all the rest of the Nation, but none at all to the Prince. He that talks at this rate, must either have found out a New Gospel, or very grosly Misinterpreted the Old.

A Cheater, or a Housebreaker, a Highway-man by Land, or a Pirate by Sea, may make himself Possessor of my Goods; but he can never have a Right and Title to them. His Unjust Possession, conveys no Just Claim to them; but I am still at Liberty to use all

* Multum tamen falluntur qui existimant, cum reges acta quædam sua nolunt rata esse, nisi à Senatu, aut alio cætu aliquo probentur, partitionem fieri potestatis. *Grot. de Jur. Bel. ac P.* l. 1. c. 3. Sect. 18. Illam Legislationem quæ alii quam summæ potestati competit, nihil imminuere de jure summæ potestatis. *Id. de imp. sum. pot. circa* Sacra, c. 8. p. 193.

Law-

Lawful means for their Recovery. I may Sue him at Law if I can come at him, or may Profecute him as a Malefactor, and he be made to refund what he has either by Fraud or Force got Wickedly into his Power. Or if either through my want of ſufficient Witneſſes, or his ſuborning Falſe ones, by the Corruption of the Judge, or the Partiality and Perjury of the Jury, he ſhould eſcape with his Ill-gotten Prey, he is ſtill as much oblig'd, in the Sight of God as ever, to make me Satisfaction for the Injury I have received by him. So long as he deprives me of what I have the ſole Propriety in, ſo long he continues a Tranſgreſſor and an Uſurper in God's account, and can hope for no forgiveneſs at His Hands, without a previous Repentance and Reſtitution. According to that known Saying of * St. *Auguſtin*, *Non remittetur peccatum, niſi reſtituatur ablatum.* There is no Remiſſion of the Sin to be hoped for, without Reſtitution firſt made.

And is not the Law the ſame for Princes, as for private Perſons? Are they not both alike God's Creatures, and his Subjects? And muſt not both hope to be ſaved upon the ſame Terms of the Goſpel? Is not the Eighth Commandment preſcribed as a Rule to all, both high and low, honourable and ignoble, Prince and Peaſant, to him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and to him that grindeth at the Mill? And are not all equally obliged to the faithful and conſcientious Obſervance of it? How then comes Mr. *H.* to aſcribe the ſame Authority to the unjuſt as to the rightful Poſſeſſor of a Crown? I am ſure he finds nothing in Scripture to countenance ſuch a wild Notion, but a great deal againſt it; as I ſhall ſhew preſently. But before I come to that, I muſt obſerve,

3. That this Doctrine of his is totally ſubverſive of our *Engliſh* Conſtitution. For there is nothing more generally acknowledged by all, than that the Conſtitution of our Monarchy is Hereditary. So ſays the

---

* *Epiſt.* 54.

Lord Chief Juſtice * *Coke*, the † Lord Chancellor *Elleſmere*, ‖ Judge *Jenkins*. Whence the Author of the *Preſent State of England*, affirms it as a known Truth, that ‡ *upon the Death of the King, the next of Kindred, though born out of the Dominions of* England, *or born of Parents not Subjects of* England, *as by the Law, and many Examples in the* Engliſh Hiſtory, *it doth manifeſtly appear, is, and is immediately King, before any* Proclamation, Coronation, Publication, or *Conſent of* Peers, *or* People. To this Purpoſe alſo, ſpeak our Hiſtories, and our Statutes. For, from hence it was that * King *Stephen* having uſurped the Throne, was forced to a Compromiſe with the Empreſs *Maud*, whoſe Right it was, and her Son *Henry*, afterwards *Henry* II. As alſo in the Statute of Trea-

---

* *The Kings of* England, *who are* Monarchs *and* abſolute Princes, *hold their Kingdoms and Dominions, by* lawful Succeſſion, *and by* inherent Birthright, *and* Deſcent of Inheritance, according to the Fundamental Laws *of this Realm.* Rep. 5. *p.* 39. *The King holdeth the Kingdom by* Birthright inherent, *by* Deſcent from the Blood Royal, *whereupon* Succeſſion *doth attend.* Rep. 7. *p.* 18.

† *Among undoubted Maxims and Principles of our Law, theſe are mentioned:* In Caſes of the Crown, The Female to inherit: The eldeſt ſole to be preferred: No Reſpect of Half-Blood: No Tenant in Dower, or by the Curteſy of the Crown: No Diſability of the King's Perſon, by Infancy, *&c. Speech touching the* Poſtnati. *p.* 36. *All which Expreſſions plainly ſuppoſe the Crown hereditary.*

‖ *That the King is not a Perſon truſted with a Power, but that it is his Inherent Birthright from God, Nature, and the Law.* Jenkins rediviv. *p.* 23. *We maintain that the King is King* by an inherent Birthright, *by Nature, by God's Law, and by the Law of the Land.* p. 38. *All our Books of Law ſay they have the Crown by Deſcent, and the Statutes of the Land declare that they have the ſame by inherent Birthright.* p. 58.

‡ *Part* 1. *Ch.* 5.

* Collier's *Eccl. Hiſt. of* Great Britain. *l.* 4. *p.* 341. Polyd. Verg. *Angl. Hiſt. l.* 12. *p.* 204, 205.

ſons

ſons, * it is declared High-Treaſon *to compaſs or imagine the Death*, not only *of the King or Queen*, but *of the King's eldeſt Son*, who is there alſo expreſly ſtiled *HIS HEIR*. Hence likewiſe † *Richard* Duke of *York*'s Title was owned by the Houſe of Lords, and they declared that *it could not be defeated*; the ‖ Three *Henries* are ſo often ſtiled *Pretenſed Kings*, and *Kings in Deed, but not in Right*; and ‡ *Richard* III. ſtands attainted by the Name of *Richard Duke of Glouceſter*, namely, by reaſon of his not having Right to the Crown, whilſt his Niece *Elizabeth*, afterwards Queen to King *Henry* VIIth. was before him. And hence again, * *the Lady Jane Gray*, was forced to *lay down the Title of QUEEN*, and the next Year was put to Death for having aſſumed it. But the fulleſt Proof of all, and than which a fuller cannot be deſired, is that of the Parliament of King † *James* I.

---

* 25 *Ed.* III. *ch.* 2. † *Rot. Parl.* 39 Hen. 6. *n.* 18. Brady's *true and exact Hiſt. of the Succeſſion of the Crown*, p. 386. ‖ 1 Edw. 4. *c.* 1. ‡ 1 Hen. 7. *c.* 6. * *Biſhop of* Sarum's *Hiſt. of the Reformation*, Vol. 2. *p.* 272.

† *We therefore, your moſt humble and loyal Subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons in this preſent Parliament aſſembled, do from the Bottom of our Hearts yield to the Divine Majeſty all humble Thanks and Praiſes, not only for the ſaid unſpeakable and ineſtimable Benefits and Bleſſings abovementioned, but alſo that he hath farther enriched your Highneſs with a moſt Royal Progeny of moſt rare and excellent Gifts and Forwardneſs, and in his Goodneſs is likely to encreaſe the happy Number of them: And in moſt humble and lowly Manner do beſeech your moſt excellent Majeſty, that as a Memorial to all Poſterities, amongſt the Records of your high Court of Parliament for ever to endure, of our Loyalty, Obedience, and hearty and humble Affection, it may be publiſhed and declared in this high Court of Parliament, and Enacted by Authority of the ſame, that we (being bounden thereunto, both by the Laws of God and Man) do recognize and acknowledge (and thereby expreſs our unſpeakable Joys) that immediately upon the Diſſolution and Deceaſe of* Elizabeth, *late Queen of* England, *the Imperial Crown of the Realm of* England, *and of all the Kingdoms, Dominions, and Rights belonging to the*

same, did by inherent Birthright, and lawful and undoubted Succession, descend and come to your most excellent Majesty, as being lineally, justly, and lawfully, next and sole Heir of the Blood Royal of this Realm, as is aforesaid; and that by the Goodness of God Almighty, and lawful Right of Descent, under one Imperial Crown, your Majesty is of the Realms and Kingdoms of England, Scotland, France *and* Ireland, *the most potent and mighty King, and by God's Goodness, more able to protect and govern us your loving Subjects, in all Peace and Plenty, than any of your noble Progenitors: And thereunto we most humbly and faithfully do submit and oblige our selves, our Heirs and Posterities for ever, until the last Drop of our Blood be spent: And we do beseech your Majesty to accept the same, as the First fruits in this High Court of Parliament, of our Loyalty and Faith to your Majesty, and to your Royal Progeny and Posterity for ever: Which if your Majesty shall be pleased (as an Argument of your gracious Acceptation) to adorn with your Majesty's Royal Assent, without which it can neither be compleat and perfect, nor remain to all Posterity, according to our most humble Desire, (as a Memorial of your Princely tender Affection towards us) we shall add this also to the rest of your Majesty's unspeakable and inestimable Benefits,* 1 Jac. *cap.* 1. *n.* 4.

declaring and enacting *the Crown of this Realm,* and *all the Dominions and Rights belonging to it, to have by inherent Birthright, and lawful and undoubted Succession* descended to him, upon the Death of Queen *Elizabeth*, as next Heir of the Royal Line, and hereby obliging themselves and their Posterity, even to the last Drop of their Bloods, to His Majesty and his Royal Progeny and Posterity for ever. *

So that it is not possible to express this Matter more fully than they have done. And yet according to Mr. *H*'s Doctrine all this is blown off at once; and could but a *Simnel* or a *Warbeck* get into the Throne by whatsoever Means, he presently commences a rightful Sovereign, and the Allegiance becomes

* *See also* 1 *Mar. Sess.* 2. *cap.* 1. *&* 1 Eliz. *cap.* 3. *and the Form of proclaiming King* Charles II. *in Lord Chanc.* Clarendon's *Hist. of the Rebellion.* Part 3. p. 595.

im-

immediately as due to him, as to the most regular hereditary Monarch that ever was. Nor can I see what can be said, why the Lady *Jane Gray*, or *Oliver*, or *Richard Cromwel*, was not according to Mr. *H*'s. way of Reasoning, necessarily to have been obey'd and defended, and Queen *Mary*, and King *Charles* II. to have been opposed as Invaders of their Neighbour's Dominions.

In a Word, here you have the Inheritance of the whole Royal Family defeated; and all the Statutes that declare this to be an Hereditary Monarchy, made no better than wast Paper.

Which is such a Confusion of right and wrong, just and unjust, as totally discards the Eighth Commandment, no less than the Fifth, together with the Apostle's Exhortation, *Render therefore to all their dues*, and leaves all the Royal Family in a worse Condition than other Men, the Crown which is the greatest of Temptations, by this means becoming *præda raptoris*, the Reward of every successful Rebel's Violence and Treason. Nor can there be according to Mr. *H.* such a Sin as Usurpation, unless where the Usurper has the Misfortune to be stopped in his Career, before he can get the Crown throughly into his Possession; or else makes an ill use of it when he has it, to the Ruin of the Community. So that wheresoever this Principle prevails, he who attempts to dethrone his Prince, and set up himself in his Stead, is a Traitor, and a Villain, if he miscarry in his Attempt; but a rightful King, and a lawful Governor, if he prove so successful, as to accomplish his wicked and execrable Undertaking. Which, as I have before shewn to be highly unreasonable and unjust, so is it by no means reconcilable to the *English* Constitution, according to which our Kings are to Reign by Hereditary Descent.

4. This Notion is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, which forbid to do Injustice to any, and not less to Kings than others; and condemn the advancing of Princes by indirect and unlawful means. As is plain

from that Reprehenſion given the *Iſraelites*, by the Prophet *Hoſea*, * *They have ſet up Kings, but not by me; they have made Princes, and I knew it not*, that is, ſo as to approve or allow of it. So Reaſon would teach to expound the Expreſſion, ſince it is not poſſible for *God, to whom all things are naked and open*, to have been ignorant of it. And ſo do other Places of Scripture, where the ſame Word, and γινώσκω, that anſwers to it in the *Greek*, are uſed in this Senſe. Particularly *Pſal.* 1. 6. *The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly ſhall periſh.* And St. *Matt.* 7. 23. *Then will I profeſs unto them, I never knew you, depart from me ye that work Iniquity.* In both which Places it is manifeſt from the Antitheſis, that to be known of God, muſt neceſſarily import to be known with Approbation †. And agreeably to this uſe of the Word ſpeaks alſo the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, 1 Cor. 8. 3. *If any Man love God, the ſame is known of him.* As the contrary Phraſe is uſed likewiſe, *Iſa.* 43. 25. *I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy tranſgreſſions for mine own ſake, and will not remember thy ſins*, that is, not ſo as to puniſh the Offenders for them. And now if Kings in Poſſeſſion of others Thrones are ſet up without God, as himſelf declares, if he do not own and approve them when thus ſet up, it is very hard to comprehend, how theſe ſhould be his Ordinance, or have any Authority derived to them by him. Thoſe who Reign by a juſt legal Title he owns for his Miniſters, profeſſing of them, that they *reign by him*; but theſe others he diſcards as their own, or the People's Kings, but none of his. *Coming not in at the Door, but climbing up another Way*, they are no more *God's Ordinance* in the State, than ſuch as enter after the ſame manner would be in the Church. And we all know what Character our bleſſed Lord ‡ gives of ſuch.

Thus it appears how extravagant this firſt Poſition is, as being contrary to Reaſon, to Juſtice, to the

---

* לא ידעתי Hoſ. 8. 4. † *See alſo* Pſal. 101. 4. *and* Rom. 7. 15. ‖ Prov. 8. 15. ‡ *John* 10. 1.

Con-

Conſtitution of our Government, and to the Holy Scriptures themſelves; and that it is therefore what Mr. *H.* has no great Reaſon to be proud of.

However he thinks, * *that Subjection to Princes in Poſſeſſion, was the Practice and Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, without obliging themſelves or their Followers, to examine nicely into the Title of Princes, and the Legality of their Acceſſion to the Throne.* And is this enough that Mr. *H.* thinks ſo? Ought he not to have proved it rather? Or does he imagine, that every body muſt be juſt of his Mind, whether he ſhew any Reaſon for it, or not? This is more than he can reaſonably expect.

Therefore he † *thinks* again, that this would be *a Task too hard for all Subjects, who are equally concerned.* But what if he thinks *all Subjects* cannot diſtinguiſh nicely betwixt the Titles of Princes, does he therefore think that none of all their Subjects can? May not ſome be of a more penetrating Judgment, and have had more Experience of the World, and of the State of the Government they live under, than divers of their Neighbours? And muſt not theſe examine where their Allegiance is due, only becauſe thoſe others either will not ſet about it, or cannot hope to do it with Succeſs? Is their Neighbours Ignorance to be the Standard of theſe Mens Knowledge, or Their Indifferency the Rule of theſe Mens Duty? So long as they have immortal Souls to ſave, it nearly concerns them to beware what Promiſes they make, what Engagements they enter into, what Oaths they take, what Duty they profeſs, what Submiſſion they oblige themſelves to, and to whom; leſt otherwiſe they inconſiderately bring upon themſelves a ſevere Deſtruction. If a Fellow-Subject to whom I am indebted, dies, it is reaſonable to ſuppoſe I will be ſatisfied who is his true Executor or Adminiſtrator, before I venture to pay my Debt, leſt I make a wrong Payment to the Prejudice of the rightful Claimant, and be liable to be called again to account for

* *Page* 19. † *Ibid.*

it, and perhaps be made to pay it a ſecond Time. And ought not every Chriſtian to be much more concerned for his Soul, than for his Money? Or does not that Apoſtolical Injunction, to *render every one his due*, oblige as much in relation to the Prince, with a particular Reſpect to whom it was given, as to our Fellow-Subjects; and this whether he be in a proſperous State, or unjuſtly oppreſs'd and thruſt out of his Throne; as it is well known too many have been in all Ages? For Subjects to withdraw their Allegiance at any time from an injur'd Sovereign, and give it to a Stranger, only becauſe the former is already too highly injur'd, is but to add *affliction to his bonds*; to heap one Grievance upon another; and to try to preſs him lower, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe he is already down too low. Which would be thought an inſupportable Method of Procedure towards all the World beſides; and not very likely therefore to be taught by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, towards Princes, for whom they have ſhewn ſo peculiar a Regard.

Again, are there not Caſes, where the Titles of Princes have no Intricacy in them, but are plain and obvious to every one's Underſtanding? And is no Regard to be had to theſe? It is too much to infer, that a Subject muſt not be true to his Sovereign, whom he certainly knows to be ſo, only becauſe there have been ſome other Pretenders to a Crown, of whom it was not eaſie to determine, whether they had a Right to it, or not. In this, as in all other Inſtances of his Duty, a Man muſt ſee that he act ſincerely, as in the Sight of God, and muſt be ſure to pay his Allegiance to Him, or Her, whom he knows to be his rightful Sovereign, whether in Poſſeſſion or not. And this is no more than may be done without any *nice* Enquiry into the Intricacy of doubtful Titles. If the Caſe be ſo involved, that he cannot hope to make a right Judgment concerning it, it is but reaſonable to ſubmit to the Poſſeſſor, not upon Account of any Right accruing to him by bare Poſſeſſion, but be-

cauſe

cauſe no other Perſon appears to have a juſt Claim to his Allegiance, or to be wronged by his paying it in this Manner. But when another evidently appears to have the Right, he that would keep a clear Conſcience, and ſhew himſelf a good Subject, and a good Chriſtian, muſt perſiſt in his Fidelity to ſuch his rightful Sovereign, whatever may be the Conſequences as to this Life; not ſuffering any preſent Hopes of Advantage, or Fear of Loſſes, either in Body, Goods, or Name, to carry him over to the Side of the injurious Poſſeſſor. Nor does our bleſſed Saviour, or any one of his Apoſtles, ever teach the contrary, tho' Mr. *H.* does.

Mr. *H.* ſays, * *what is called by ſome* Uſurpation, *is not always evil*; by which he means either real Uſurpation, or not. If not, it is nothing to the purpoſe; for the Subjects Allegiance depends not upon what Princes are *called by ſome*, but what they are. If he means real Uſurpation, it is incumbent upon him to prove, That this is not always Evil. Injuſtice is always Evil; and Uſurpation, being a Species of it, cannot be Good.

Oh! but in Mr. *H*'s. Judgment, † *It is as eaſie to believe that God may be the Patron of Uſurpation, ſo far as to require Subjection to all Princes in Poſſeſſion, acting for the Good of the Public, as to believe, that God can be the Patron of the greateſt Tyranny and Oppreſſion, ſo far as to make it a neceſſary Duty, paſſively to ſubmit to the Will of Tyrants and Oppreſſors.* As much as to ſay, It no more reflects upon the Infinite Holineſs and Purity of the Divine Nature, to encourage an Unreaſonable Ambition, and the Higheſt Injuſtice, than it does to call Men to Suffer under the Violence of Wicked and Inhuman Governors, in order to his Glory, and their own incomparable Felicity in another World. And will Mr. *H.* ſtand to this ſo great an Abſurdity? I am pretty confident, that upon ſecond thoughts he will not.

---

* *Ibid.* † *Ibid.*

Suffer-

Suffering wrongfully, though from the worſt of Governors, is no Sin. Nay, if we ſuffer wrongfully, and *take it patiently*, * *this is acceptable with God*, and ſhall not loſe its Reward. But the like can in no wiſe be ſaid of Uſurping another's Right, which is in its own Nature a Heinous Crime, and will accordingly meet with a very different recompence at the Day of Judgment. There is no Compariſon betwixt Sin and Suffering; † The one is what God doth not Delight in, but the other he utterly Abominates, as being a perfect contradiction to his Pure and Holy Nature, and what he can never allow of in any. For this it was the fallen Angels were caſt out of Heaven, and deliver'd over to Everlaſting Burnings in the Bottomleſs Pit. For this our Firſt Parents were thruſt out of *Paradiſe*, and a Curſe entailed upon their Poſterity ever ſince, and even to the end of the World. And there is no ſuch Favourite of Heaven, as will not certainly be excluded thence, upon his allowance of himſelf in it. But outward Miſeries and Calamities, of whatever ſort, are only a Temporal and Tranſitory Misfortune, and may by a good improvement entitle us to a greater intereſt in the Divine Affections, and work out for us a much greater Reward, than we ſhould otherwiſe have attained to. So ſays St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. *Our light Affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory.* Whence it neceſſary follows, that it can be no derogation from any of the Divine Attributes, to expoſe Perſons to ſufferings in this World, and to enjoyn them ſubmiſſively to undergo the ſame, without taking upon them to be their own Avengers or Deliverers, and to reward them for it * ſuperabundantly in another State. But it will never follow from hence, that it is as Mr. *H.* profeſſes, as well to be believed, *that God can be the Patron of Uſurpation*, that is, of Great Injuſtice, or

* 1 *St. Pet.* 2. 20. † *Lam.* 3. 33. * καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν. 2 Cor. 4. 17.

will

will expect our Concurrence with, or Assistance of it against any whose Right is thus Unrighteously detain'd from them.

Mr. *H.* argues farther for Transferring our Allegiance to an Unjust Possessor; † Had St *Paul* intended to speak only of *such Rulers as have a Legal Right, had this been his Intention, he would rather have told them by Inspiration, how they should judge of the Right of Princes, than have said nothing, but what must, upon this supposition, have set Christians upon nice inquiries, into the Right by which the present Possessor Reigned.* I have considered his *nice Inquiries* already; and shall only ask here, Whether another might not plead with at least as much shew of Argument? That had the Apostle allow'd of Subjects transferring their Allegiance from their Lawful Governors in any case, he would have instanced in particulars, and not left Subjects to *nice enquiries*, whereby to inform themselves, to whom, and why, and when, and in what manner, and for what time they might transfer it. But the Truth is, the Apostle designed only to give a short intimation of the Duty of Christians towards the Governors under whom they did, or should afterwards, Live: And he has done it so, as to leave no reasonable ground of doubting, what his meaning was, as shall be shewn in its proper Place. At present I content my self to have only taken notice of Mr. *H*---'s Inference in this place, which from the very little I have said concerning it, appears much properer for a Popular Harangue, than for a serious and more deliberate Vindication; because having nothing of Argument in it.

And for this I have a very remarkable, as well as a very fresh Authority in the Lord Bishop of *Sarum*'s Sermon Preach'd in the Cathedral there, the 5th of this instant *November*. In which, *p.* 10. I find these words, *The* Higher Powers *that may not lawfully be* Resisted, *are only the Legal, and not the Usurping Powers.*

† *P.* 19, 20.

And

And a little after, *I will not enter into an Examination of the words of St.* Paul: *This is certain, that* the Higher Powers, *which are* ordain'd of God, *are only the lawful* Powers, *not to be applied* to Uſurpers. And I hope his Lordſhip will not be offended at my oppoſing his greater Authority to that of Mr. *H.* whom I leave to diſprove it, if he can.

I ſhall touch upon only one Expreſſion more under this Head, which is, That *It would be hard to ſay, what Legal Rights the firſt Emperors had, whom the beſt and wiſeſt of the* Romans *took for Uſurpers.* This Mr. *H.* is very ſure of; and yet what Right was it theſe Emperours wanted? 'Tis true, *Julius Cæſar* altered the Government, and made it Monarchical, as it was firſt Founded by *Romulus.* Which, I hope, Mr. *H.* will not ſay is leſs juſtifiable, than their former procedure in laying aſide their Kings had been. But when this was done, what was afterwards wanting to render him a rightful Governor? Was he not created * perpetual Dictator? and Saluted Emperor? And were not his Succeſſors Legally advanc'd to the ſame Dignity and Powers? *Auguſtus* † was not only nominated by him as his Heir and Succeſſor, but was acknowledged by the Senate, and declar'd *Auguſtus* by Senate and People. *Tiberius* ‡ was Adopted by *Auguſtus*, and appointed his Firſt Executor, and had been his Collegue in the Empire, and Partaker of the *Tribunitian* Power, and ſhewn to all the Armies; yet || he moſt obſtinately declin'd the Title of Emperor or Father of his Country, refus'd the Government, as too great a Burthen for him, and fit for none but an *Auguſtus* to manage; declared, that by the ſhare he had had in it, he experimentally knew the weight of it, and that it ought

* Plut *in vit.* C. Cæſ. *p.* 734. Sueton. C. Ju. Cæſ. *c.* 76. Xiphilin. *in* Jul. Cæſ. *& Liv. Epit.* l. 116. † Xiph. *p.* 30. 32, 69. ‡ *Suet. in vit.* Auguſti *c. ult.* Tiber. *c.* 15. Tacit. *Annal. l.* 1. *p.* 4. Vell. Paterc. *l.* 2. *p.* 64. || *Suet. in vit.* Tiber. *c.* 26. Xiph. *p.* 104. Tacit. *Annal. l.* 1. *p.* 35. Ut imperium iniret, & Patris Patriæ appellationem —— obſtinatiſſimè recuſâſſe. *Suet. c.* 67.

not

not to be committed to any single Person; and * would not undertake it but at the earnest and repeated entreaty of the Senate. *Caligula* did not shew himself so backward to accept of the Empire, yet † he had it committed to him by the Senate, to the wonderful satisfaction and joy of the People, who also expressed a very particular concern for his Safety and Welfare. *Claudius*, it is true, ‡ was first set up by the Soldiers and very unexpectedly, when he had been hiding himself in the Palace; but he was soon after acknowledged by the Consuls, was made Emperour, and had all the Honours decreed him, that had been given to his Predecessors. Upon his Death *Nero*, ‖ tho' very Young, was immediately Proclaim'd Emperour, and carried in a Litter into the Army, and thence brought back, by the Soldiers, into the Court, and owned by the Senate. And now what farther was wanting to make these Lawful and Rightful Governours? What flaw can Mr. *H.* find in any of their Titles? They had been solemnly invested with the Imperial Dignity and Ensigns, had been approved of by the Senate, and owned by the People, and had no Claimant to plead a Right against them. So that all Mr. *H.* can possibly make of this instance, will not promote his Cause one tittle. For without doubt a free People may give up their Freedom, may submit, and pay what Allegiance, and to whom they please; but then these Governors, thus own'd and submitted to, are not to be accounted Usurpers, nor to be Obeyed purely upon the account of their being in Possession; but because of their being Rightfully so. And so they fall not under our present Consideration, nor can be esteem'd the Subject of this Debate, which is design'd only for such Princes as at any time are set up, in opposition to other rightful Sovereigns who are justly

* Tacit. *Annal. l.* 1. *p.* 5, 12, 13. Vell. Paterc. *p.* 75. Suet. *c.* 24. † *Suet. in vit.* Calig. *c.* 14. ‡ Xiph. & *Aurel. Vict.* ‖ Sueton. *in vit.* Ner. *c.* 8. Tacit. *Annal. l.* 12.

enti-

entituled to the Power these are possess'd of. And of such only Mr. *H.* ought to have shewn, that the Subjects Allegiance is due to them; and not to have insisted upon the *Roman* Emperors, who could have no lawful Competitors, themselves being at that time, the only Lawful Governors.

The Summ is, That God Almighty is a Patron of Right and Justice, and not of Injustice and Usurpation. Nor will he allow his Worshippers to transfer their Allegiance from their Natural and Rightful Sovereign, to whatsoever Intruder that shall at any time have got the Possession of the Throne, and shall have Might and Power, but no Legal Authority over them; and that a Faithful Adherence to the Hereditary Constitution of our Government in particular, is not the less Reasonable and Honest, or the less agreeable to the Doctrine of the Gospel, because Mr. *H.* thinks it not necessary.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Whether a bad Governor cannot be that Minister to whom St. Paul *requires Submission and Obedience?*

MR. *H*--'s Second Position is this; * *That Governor, who is not a terror to Evil Works, but to Good; who is not the Minister of Good to the Vertuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only, and who is not continually watching for the Good and Happiness of Humane Society, is not the Governor whom St.* Paul *means, and to whom he presses Obedience. This Mr.* H. *thought he might safely say, because it is nothing but a Recapitulation of St.* Paul's *own words, without any Interpretation of them.* But did he think Right? And is it really so, That St. *Paul* will not allow bad Governors to be the Ministers of God? Does the Apostle say, none are to be submitted to as such, but who truly answer the end of their Institution? This one would expect to find very clear, from what Mr. *H.* here Asserts; but if any consult St. *Paul* himself, he will find it to be quite otherwise: For St. *Paul* requires subjection to the *Higher Powers*, assuring us *there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be are ordain'd of God.* As if the Apostle should have said, Whosoever have their Commission from Almighty God, and so are made by him † the Higher Powers, (whether they act suitably to the trust repos'd in them, or not) are to have Subjection paid them; And for this Reason, because *there is no Power but of God*, none invested with Supream Authority, who has not received it from God. And if none have it but from God, then Wicked and Tyrannical Powers have theirs from him.

* *P.* 21. † Tropus hic est, ἐξουσία pro iis qui dignitatem habent, quo [tropo] non temere utitur, ut sciamus, Subjectionem ipsis dignitatibus habendam, etiamsi indigni sint qui sunt eò evecti. *M. Pol.* in loc.

This

This S. *Auguſtin* underſtood to be plainly the Apoſtle's meaning; and therefore agreeably hereto, ſpeaking of the *Roman* Empire, he tells us, * that *God beſtows the Heavenly Felicity on the Godly only; but the Kingdoms of the Earth, on both Godly and Ungodly, as it pleaſeth him.* And a little after, † *He that gave the Kingdom to* the Cruel Marius, *gave it alſo to* the moſt Gracious Cæſar; *He that gave it to* Auguſtus, one of the beſt of Princes, *gave it likewiſe to* Nero one of the worſt; *He that gave it to the* Kind and Good Natur'd Veſpaſians, *gave it no leſs to the* Blood-Thirſty *Domitian.* And again, *he that gave it to* Conſtantine the Chriſtian, *gave it afterward to* Julian the Apoſtate. Whereto agrees that of *Theodoret*, * *When God is graciouſly inclined towards a People, he gives them Rulers, that have a Reverence for Juſtice;* —— *but when he deſigns to Puniſh a Diſobedient Nation, he grants them to be,* that is, he puts them, *under the Power of evil Governors. For I will ſet over them, ſays God, Young Men to be their Princes, and Scoffers ſhall have Dominion over them.* And before either of theſe, it was *Irenæus*'s Doctrine, that † *By whoſe Command Men are born, by his Command Kings*

---

* Quæ cùm ita ſint, non tribuamus dandi regni atq; imperii poteſtatem, niſi Deo vero, qui dat fælicitatem, regnum cælorum ſolis piis: Regnum vero terrenum, & piis & impiis, ſicut ei placet, cui nihil injuſtè placet. De civ. Dei. *L.* 5. *C.* 21.

† Qui Mario, ipſe Caio Cæſari: qui Auguſto, ipſe & Neroni: Qui Veſpaſianis, vel Patri, vel Filio, ſuaviſſimis imperatoribus, ipſe & Domitiano crudeliſſimo. Et nè per ſingulos ire neceſſe ſit, qui Conſtantino Chriſtiano, ipſe Apoſtatæ Juliano. *Ibid.*

* Εὐμοίρως μὲν τοι ὧν δίδωσι ἀρχοντας τοῖς βίοις τὸ δίκαιον. δίδωσι γὰρ αὐτοῖς, φησὶ, ποιμένας κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, &c. παιδεύσασι δὲ πλημμελοῦντας βυλόμενον καὶ παραγ. πονηρῶν ἀρχόντων ἀρχὰς συγχωρεῖ. ἐπιτήσω γὰρ, φησὶ, νεανίσκους ἀρχοντας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμπαιδίαι κυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν. Theod. in *Rom.* 13. 1.

† Cujus enim juſſu homines naſcuntur, hujus juſſu & Reges conſtituuntur, apti his qui illo tempore ab ipſis regantur. *Iren.* adv. hær. *l.* 5. *c.* 24.

are

are Constituted, as suits best with the Circumstances of such as are to be Govern'd by them. For some of them are given for the amendment and benefit of their Subjects, and the Preservation of Justice; and others for Fear, and Punishment, and Reproof; and some again for Mocking, and Reproach, and Pride, according as they shall be found Worthy: the just Judgment of God disposing all things with the greatest Equity, as we have said.

Thus St. *Paul*'s Doctrine was understood in the early Ages of the Church. And that there was, and is, very good Reason for understanding it so, whatsoever Mr. *H.* may apprehend to the contrary, will appear from other Places of Scripture, where Wicked Kings are sufficiently allowed to be from God. For to pass over the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, who were more immediately Commission'd by him, I shall begin with *Nebuchadnezzar*, whom I believe Mr. *H.* will not affirm to have been such a King as he describes St. *Paul*'s *Powers* to be, one who was a true Patron to all that did well, and *a Terror to evil doers only*, yet ‡ *Daniel* declares him to have received his Power from God, in these words; *Thou, O King, art King of Kings; for the God of Heaven hath given thee a Kingdom, Power, Strength and Glory. And wheresoever the children of Men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hands; and hath made thee Ruler over them all.* And God himself * calls him his Servant, and orders all Nations to serve him and his Posterity. As Mr. *H.* has been told, † though he has not thought fit to take notice of it. And of the *Romans* our Blessed Lord is positive concerning *Pilate*, that his Authority was from God. *Thou couldst have no* ‡ *Power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.* Nor is to be thought

‡ *Dan.* 2. 37, 38. * *Jer.* 27. 6, 7. † *Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject, p.* 12. ‡ *It is* ἐξουσία *in the Original, the same word that is used by St.* Paul *in the place now under Consideration.*

St. *Paul* would ‖ have *appealed to Cæsar*, that is, to no better a Prince than *Nero*, if he had not believed him to be *God's Ordinance*. Besides that, he blames himself for having spoken disrespectfully of the High-Priest * who had *Commanded him to be smitten contrary to the Law*, and pleads his own Ignorance in doing it. These were such Governors as I am very apt to think Mr. *H.* will not pretend to have answered the Character he so much insists upon, of being really and in fact, as well as in the intention of their Office, *the Ministers of God for good to them that do good, and to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.* And yet it is fully testified, That they were God's Ministers, were set up and made to Reign by him, and had all their Authority from him.

And thus being God's Ministers, though such as acted unagreeably to, and unworthily of the Charge wherewith they were entrusted, Mr. *H.* will find it a hard task to prove, that they were not to be Reverenced, Obeyed, and Submitted to, Actively in their Lawful Commands, and Passively where they exceeded the bounds of their Commission; or which comes to the same thing, that, they were not such Powers, as the Apostle requires Subjection to.

The Prophet *Hosea* tells the *Israelites*, † that *God gave them a King in his Anger, and took him away in his Wrath*; which words are thus Paraphrased in one of our Church's Homilies, * *God giveth a Prince in his Anger, meaning an evil one; and taketh away a Prince in his Displeasure, meaning, especially when he taketh away a good Prince, for the sins of the People.* And then it follows a little after, *Here you see that God placeth as well evil Princes as good, and for what cause he doth both.* But Mr. *H.* it seems understands better things; with whom a Prince is no longer to be looked upon as God's Minister, than he acts in pursuance of his Institution; and if he ventures to deviate from

‖ *Act.* 25. 11. * *Act.* 23. 3. † *Hos.* 13. 11.
* *First part of the Sermon against Wilful Rebellion.*

his

his Rule, he loſes his Authority, and is anſwerable for his Miſ-government, not only to God, who ſet him in that Station ; but to All, even the Meaneſt of the People, † who are hereby Authorized to riſe up againſt him, and try to ſhake off his Yoke.

Though I am exceedingly miſtaken, if he find any ſuch Commiſſion given to Subjects, either in the words now under debate, or any other part of Scripture. And here I have the Authority of a Right Reverend Prelate of my ſide, the preſent Lord Biſhop of *Ely*; whoſe words are theſe, ‡ *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers; to which Chriſtian Precept there is no Exception to be found, for any Perſon, in any inſtance, from the one end of the Chriſtian Inſtitution to the other.*

Yet is Mr. *H.* ſo fully perſwaded of the Truth of his Poſition, that he has ſaid, and again ‖ repeats it, that all we can poſſibly collect *from the Apoſtle's Injunctions in this place is, That it is the indiſpenſable Duty of Subjects to ſubmit themſelves to ſuch Governors, as anſwer the good end of their Inſtitution; to ſuch Rulers as he here deſcribes, ſuch as are not a Terror to Good Works, but to the Evil; ſuch as promote the Public Good, and are continually attending upon this very thing.* This, he ſays, is the utmoſt, that there is any poſſibility of collecting from theſe Words of the Apoſtle. And yet he cannot but know, that more has been actually collected from them, and by abundance of very Great Men, much more Learned Divines, and of much better Judgment, as well as greater Reading, than himſelf can pretend to be. And they had very good Reaſon for it, conſidering that the Apoſtle's Argument is principally founded upon the unlawfulneſs of *Reſiſting the Powers that are*; upon this account, that they are the *Ordinance of God.* Whence it neceſſarily follows, that ſince God ſets up Wicked and Ungodly, Tyrannical and Perſecuting Princes, no leſs than thoſe

† *P.* 8. ‡ *Sermon before the Lord Mayor*, Jan. 26. 1684.
‖ *P.* 22.

of a better Temper, and more heartily disposed to promote their Subjects Welfare, Submission is therefore due to them. Nor can they be Resisted, without *Resisting the Ordinance of God*, and thereby exposing our selves to Eternal Misery and Destruction. And what follows concerning the benefit and usefulness of Government, which Mr. *H.* makes his only Motive to Submission and Obedience, is only a farther collateral Consideration, for exciting to the more ready Compliance with this Institution of the Apostle, it being what every Body must acknowledge fit and reasonable, That they who ordinarily undergo a great Burden of Care and Solicitude for their Subjects, and are great occasions of their Welfare, should have a suitable return of Reciprocal Fidelity and Duty from them.

Nor needed the Apostle to have declared himself more fully, supposing it to be as I have said; because the words thus consider'd, do sufficiently put a bar to all Resistance. Mr. *H.* I confess, would have taught him to say, * That *the Prince acts by God's Authority, in all the instances of Oppression, Barbarity, and Violence, he could possibly be Guilty of*; as if God had given him a Commission to act in this manner. A Doctrine that he charges others to have since taught for him: Though I dare be confident, that amongst all the large Catalogue of Eminent Writers, that have appeared in behalf of the truly Christian, though of late unhappily exploded Doctrine of Non-resistance, he will not produce one that has said it. There is no doubt, but when a Prince goes contrary to his Duty, and the end of his Commission, he does this of himself, and not by virtue of God's Authority delegated to him. Yet since at this same instant, he is invested with God's Authority, for other better purposes, though not for these just now mention'd; that investiture sets him above the *Peoples Opposition*, since they cannot Resist him, even in these instances, without *resisting the*

* *P.* 23.

Ordi-

Ordinance of God; the Sin the Apoſtle is here providing againſt. And the want of this Diſtinction, between the Perſon inveſted with the *Power*, *and the* Abuſe of that Power to very different purpoſes, from thoſe for which he is ſo inveſted; the want, I ſay, of this Diſtinction has been the Foundation of Mr. *H*'s. whole Book, and the many erroneous Aſſertions that occurr from one end of it to the other.

Here I had thought to have concluded this Chapter; but I find * Three other Aſſertions, two of them in it, and the third relating to it, which call for a particular conſideration, and muſt not therefore be paſſed over without it. *Had it been St.* Paul's *meaning*, ſays Mr. *H. to preſs Obedience to the greateſt* Tyrants and Oppreſſors; *or had he had in his Eye any particular* Emperor, *who was a Monſter not only of Villany, but of* Publick Oppreſſion, *(as ſome repreſent his Senſe;) nothing can be imagined more unaccountable, than that he ſhould give ſuch a Deſcription of* Governors, *as to exclude thoſe whom there was moſt occaſion to mention; and that he ſhould reaſon Chriſtians into a Conſcientious Subjection in ſuch a manner, as cannot conclude for* Subjection, *to any but ſuch* Governors *as he deſcribes in the* foregoing *Words; and as come up to that ſenſe of them, in which he meant they ſhould be underſtood.* For anſwer whereto,

1. Let it be obſerv'd, That nothing can be more unreaſonable, than it is, when the Apoſtle requires Subjection to the *Powers that be*, to imagine as Mr. *H.* does, that he intended it not to be paid to the Emperor then Reigning. Nor is it poſſible to conceive who elſe ſhould be at *Rome* the Power in being at that time.

2. If theſe words relate to Heathen Governors, as well as others, and to ſuch amongſt them as Reigned in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, and eſpecially in the time of the Apoſtles, (as they moſt certainly did) they are neceſſarily to be underſtood in

* *P.* 24.

such a Sense, as may some way agree to these Governors; unless we should Represent the *Apostle* as Reasoning very Injudiciously and Absurdly. And accordingly to be *a terrour not to Good Works, but to the evil*; *to* be the *Minister of God for Good*, and a *Revenger to execute Wrath upon him that doth Evil*, must not be thought to denote a care to protect and encourage the Profession of the Gospel, but must relate rather to the common Doctrines and Practices of Natural Religion, and more especially such Branches of it, as tend to the Security and Happiness of Society; such as ordinary Intercourse and Commerce amongst the Subjects; Submission and Obedience to Authority; Defence of the Innocent and Peaceable; Suppression of Thefts, Murders, Rebellions, Treasons, *&c.* These things, generally speaking, are for the Good of Society, and to maintain and help them forward is so essential a part of the Magistrate's Duty, that none of them but apply themselves to it, though too often neither so Diligently nor so Uprightly as they ought. The Generality of Governors do in a great Measure make them their Care; And there is none so bad, as not to do it in some degree, Courts of Law being open in all Nations, and Judges, and other Officers of divers kinds appointed for the Administration of Justice. Whereby many Evils are prevented, and Benefits enjoy'd, which may require some return of Gratitude and Submission. And even in the most Unhappy Circumstances, in the worst of Times, the best way to meet with Quiet, and Protection, and Encouragement, is to be Submissive to the Powers that be, and Observe all those Duties that have a more especial respect to them as Governors, though not so Good as were to be wished. And I should rather choose to understand the Words in this lax and general Sense, than strain them up with Mr. *H.* to such a pitch, as could in no wise suit with the *Powers in being*, when the Apostle lived, and to whom they

* *Eph.* 5. 25, *&c.*

required

required all Christians to be Subject; and indeed with very few since. And if we interpret the Words after this manner, as in all reason they ought to be interpreted, not only the Apostle does not *exclude those whom there was most occasion to mention*, but moreover his Reasoning in the Third and Fourth Verses, is exactly consonant with that in the Two former, which according to Mr. *H*'s interpretation it never can be.

3. Mr. *H.* acknowledges, * *it is not to be suppos'd, that the Apostle meant that all of them* [all Governors] *did always perform this good part*, [of studying continually to promote the Public Happiness] *but that it was their great business, and the only end of their Institution*, as he makes it the ground of the Obedience that was to be paid to them. And † *as far as they deflect from God's Will, which is declar'd to be promoting the Public Good*, so far he affirms them to *lose their Title to these Declarations of the Apostle*. Here Mr. *H.* may please to tell, whether all that in any wise *deflect* from the Promotion of the Publick Good, though but now and then, and to no very great degree, can be said in his Sense to be *the Ministers of God for Good*, or at least to be *continually attending upon this very thing?* For I cannot well understand, how *attending continually upon it*, and sometimes *deflecting from it*, can agree to the same Person. I would gladly learn of him also, Whether upon every such *Deflection* they cease to be the *Ministers of God*, and so become Resistible. If they do, what Governor ever was there in the World, that did not sometimes fall into this condition, and cease to be *God's Ordinance?* If they do not, how does Mr. *H*'s stricter Sense of these words agree to these, any more than it does to worse Governors? These latter indeed appear less mindful of their People and their Duty, than the other; but if the former cease to be *God's Ministers*, these others can do no more. One Question more

* *P.* 4. † *P.* 7.

I would beg leave to ask of Mr. *H.* in this Place; Were *Trajan* and the *Antonines*, and those other of the *Roman* Emperors, who were singularly remarkable for their moral Virtues and their earnest Endeavours and constant Solicitude to advance the *Roman* Glory, and carry it to the highest Pitch, but yet at the same time persecuted the Christians to a great Degree; were these the Ministers of God or not? They did certainly attend to their Government, and study the Welfare and Happiness of their People, to the best of their Judgment, and as the Laws of the Empire directed: So far were they from seeking entirely to ruin the Society. And yet they were professed Enemies to Christ, and sought the Ruin of his Church and Religion, and actually destroyed great Numbers of his most faithful Disciples; in which it is certain they grossly *deflected from the Will of God*, and so according to Mr. *H. so far lost their Title to these Declarations of the Apostle*, and to the Obedience required to the Magistrate as *God's Ordinance*. Here therefore I am at a great loss to find out, according to Mr. *H*'s. Principles, how a sincere and good Christian ought to have demeaned himself towards them; whether he was to obey them as the Ministers of God, whilst they persecuted his Church; or whether they were to be resisted, perhaps deposed, whilst they made it their constant Business, not *entirely to ruin the Safety and Happiness of the Society*, but to promote its Grandeur, extend its Dominions, and enlarge its Authority to the utmost of their Power.

4. Had the Apostle taught Resistance to bad Governors, as Mr. *H.* would have him, this had been as * *Origen* observes, the readiest Way he could have taken to justify all the Persecutions that were at any time raised against the Christians, namely by making them declared Enemies to all Governors whom they did not believe rightly to answer the End of their Institution, which according to Mr. *H*'s. Doctrine no

* *In Rom.* 13. 5, 6.

Hea-

Heathen Emperour could do; becauſe no Heathen Emperour could ſet himſelf with all his Might to promote and encourage Chriſtianity, which is the beſt Way of promoting the *publick Happineſs* of any Nation. This would have repreſented the Goſpel as a dangerous Syſtem of Religion, *hurtful to Kings and Princes*, even to all the Kings and Princes in the World during the firſt three hundred Years after Chriſt; and the Chriſtians as a ſeditious Set of Men, whoſe Buſineſs it muſt be to incenſe Subjects againſt their Sovereigns, and to raiſe Inſurrections and Rebellions whereſoever they came. Which would have given their Enemies at all Times ſuch a Handle againſt them, as they could never meet with even under their ſharpeſt and moſt outrageous Perſecutions; under all which the Chriſtians thought themſelves indiſpenſably obliged, to follow their bleſſed Saviour's Example, * *who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he ſuffered, threatned not, but committed himſelf to him that judgeth righteouſly.* Nor would they take upon them to defend themſelves againſt their lawful Governors, tho' when they were grown very numerous and powerful, as ſhall be ſhewn in its proper Place.

There is alſo another Paſſage in this Chapter that muſt be conſidered, leſt Mr. *H.* ſhould complain of me, as he does of others, for not attending to his Anſwers. I mentioned St. *Paul*'s Appeal to *Nero*, as an Acknowledgment of his Divine Authority. But this Argument Mr. *H.* had ſpoken to, *P.* 27. and thither therefore I muſt follow him. *His* [the Apoſtle's] *appealing to the Courts of Judicature at* Rome, *which he did out of Choice, and not as a Point of Duty*; this, ſays Mr. *H. can prove nothing, but that he was always ready to inſiſt upon his* Right *and* Liberty, *as he was a* Roman *born, and thought himſelf more likely to have Juſtice done him there, than at* Jeruſalem. Where it is obſervable, Mr. *H.* ſlides off from *Cæſar*, to whom

* 1 *Pet.* 2. 23.

the

the Appeal was made, to *the Courts of Judicature at Rome*; as if they had been a distinct Power from that of the Emperour, and had not acted only by his Commission. Which since they certainly did, this shews St. *Paul* to have believed *Nero* had yet Authority to do him Justice; and by Consequence that he might yet *be called God's Vicegerent* * *without the highest* Prophaneſs, and at this Time was really so; unless we would suppose the Apostle to appeal to one whom he knew not to be *God's Minister*, but rather † the *Minister of the Devil*. Nor does the Instance of St. *Paul* and *Silas*'s Behaviour towards the Magistrates at *Philippi*, *Acts* 16. 37. in the least contradict this; all that can be inferred from that being only, that they had misapplied their Authority *in binding uncondemn'd Romans*; not that they had no Authority to bind others, who were neither *Romans*, nor *uncondemned*. Mr. *H.* was hard put to it, when he chose to write at this rate.

Well, but there is another Passage yet remaining, which deserves, if any thing in his whole Book, to be well considered. It is objected to him, as he notes, *p.* 28. of the *Preface* to the Second Edition of his *Measures*, &c. that *the Apostle useth two different* Arguments, *of which*, says he, *I consider but* one, *neglecting the* other *wholly*. *The* One *is taken, they say, from the* Divine Authority *of* Magistrates; *the* other *from the Usefulness of their* Office to Humane Society. A very material Objection! and which any one upon the first reading of the Words may see to be well grounded, and unanswerable. Mr. *H.* himself confesses *the Duty of* Submission *and* Non-resistance ‖ *is laid down in such absolute Terms, that many have been induced from hence, to think, that the Christian Religion denies the Subject all Liberty of redressing the greatest Grievances*; which, if he mean of redressing them by Arms and Violence, is most true. And again, that ‡ *those who do not examine into the Foun-*

* *Vindication*, p. 25. † *P.* 114. ‖ *P.* 5. ‡ *P.* 6.

dation

dation upon which the Apoſtle *builds this Doctrine, and into the whole of what he delivers*, that is, who do not read the Words with Mr. *H*'s. Spectacles, and prefer his Comment before the plain Text it ſelf, *may indeed be apt to think that in theſe Words there is little Relief allowed to* Subjects, *tho' lying under the greateſt Oppreſſions imaginable.* Yet Mr. *H.* bears up manfully againſt the Apoſtle, and like one who ſcorns to be baffled. *Yet*, ſays he, *yet*, notwithſtanding the Words are thus clearly againſt all Reſiſtance, *methinks on the other hand.* What in Contradiction to the Apoſtle? This is ſomewhat that is very particular. But what is it Mr. *H. thinks on the other hand?* Why no leſs than this: *If the* Apoſtle *had done nothing but enforced the Duty of* Obedience *upon the Subject, it would be reaſonable to judge from the Nature of the Thing, and the Abſurdity of the contrary, that he meant this only as a general Rule in all ordinary Caſes, rather than to imagine that he ſhould abſolutely conclude whole Nations under Miſery and Slavery, without Hopes of Redreſs.* Which is neither more, nor leſs, than that, be the Apoſtle's Words ever ſo plain in themſelves, yet if the natural Importance of them do not ſuit with Mr. *H*'s. Scheme of Government, it is unreaſonable, and ſome other Senſe right or wrong muſt be put upon them. And ſo Mr. *H*'s *Meaſures of Submiſſion* muſt be the Teſt to try the Apoſtle's Doctrine by; and not the Apoſtle's Doctrine the Teſt of his *Meaſures.* But this only by the Way. Let us now ſee what Anſwer he returns to the Objection.

1. The Firſt is this; *granting this to be true*, that the Apoſtle makes uſe of two Arguments againſt Reſiſtance, and yet Mr. *H.* takes Notice only of one of them; *granting this*, I ſay, *to be true, nothing can follow from hence in Favour of* Abſolute Non-reſiſtance; *for I*, as it follows, *have ſufficiently ſhewn in the following* Treatiſe, *that as the* Argument *taken from the* Uſefulneſs *of their* Office *cannot hold good, when they are the* Plagues *and* Deſtroyers *of* Humane Society;

ſo

ſo the Argument *drawn from their* Divine Authority, *cannot hold good in thoſe* Caſes, *in which they cannot be ſaid to act by a* Divine Authority *without* Blaſphemy. In which Anſwer of his I can ſee nothing but what I have already diſprov'd in this Chapter, and I ſhall not trouble the Reader with a needleſs Repetition.

2. He ſays in the next Place, *It is manifeſt that they are not really two diſtinct* Arguments, *nor doth it appear St.* Paul *makes them two diſtinct* Arguments, *but rather that he reſolves all into the* Uſefulneſs *of their* Office, *which is the only Proof he gives of their being* ordained of God, *viz. as it is his Will that an* Office *ſo uſeful to* Society *ſhould be kept up, and ſubmitted to, in the World. Nor can any of the preſent* Rulers *of this World pretend to any other* Divine Right, *or* Divine Authority, *but what reſults from the Uſefulneſs of their* Office *to* Humane Society. And *this is the only Proof he gives* of this groundleſs Aſſertion. It is for his Purpoſe that the *Uſefulneſs of Government*, and *a Divine Commiſſion for it*, ſhould be all one; and tho' they are in their own Nature as clearly diſtinguiſhed as can be, and are uſed diſtinctly by the Apoſtle, he is pleaſed however magiſterially to affirm they are not diſtinct, but one and the ſame Thing. He is reſolved they ſhall be the ſame, and therefore they muſt be ſo. But if any be ſo obſtinate as not to take his Word for it, he muſt not expect to have it proved, becauſe it is falſe, and cannot be proved.

3. He *adds*, that *if their acting by* Authority *from* God *in ſome* Caſes, *be ſufficient to eſtabliſh* abſolute Non-reſiſtance *in* all Caſes, *it will likewiſe as effectually eſtabliſh* abſolute Active Obedience *in* all Caſes. But how comes Mr. *H.* to talk at this rambling rate? He cannot be ignorant, and I am ſure he ought not to have forgot, that the Scripture has undoubtedly limited our *Active Obedience* by teaching to * *obey God rather than Man.* Which Direction is a ſufficient Bar

* *Acts* 5. 29.

to

to an *Active Obedience* to any unlawful Command, tho' of the greateſt Monarch upon Earth. But can Mr. *H.* ſhew a like Prohibition of ſuffering Perſecution in any Caſe? He is wiſer, I dare ſay, than to pretend to it. Yet till he can, he muſt own the Caſe is not at all parallel, and in ſhort that this Argument is no Argument at all.

4. He makes the * Caſe of one's own Natural Prince, and that of an Invader to be all one, not conſidering that howſoever the Invading Prince be the *Miniſter of God* in his own Dominions, and to thoſe committed to his Charge, this does not make him ſo to others who have no Relation to him, nor owe him any Sort of Allegiance. Whence as an *Engliſh Subject* owes him no Duty in any reſpect, ſo in particular he is under no Obligation to forbear reſiſting his Invaſion. So far from this, that on the contrary, the Allegiance Subjects owe to their proper Sovereign, obliges them in Duty to oppoſe and reſiſt ſuch an Invader, according to their Station and Ability, and ſo long as they can hope to do any Service by it. So that whatever Force there is in this Argument, it can be of no Uſe to Mr. *H.* in as much as, inſtead of a Parallel, it proves rather a contradictory Inſtance; and inſtead of favouring his Cauſe, weakens, if not totally deſtroys it. For it will by no Means follow, that becauſe I may reſiſt an invading Prince, in Defence of my own Sovereign, therefore I may reſiſt my own Sovereign too. The Argument is much ſtronger on the other hand, That becauſe I am indiſpenſably bound to adhere to my Prince againſt ſuch an Invader, therefore I may not reſiſt Him or Her, in any other Caſe.

So that upon the whole Matter, as I think I have fully proved Obedience and Submiſſion to be required by the Apoſtle, to Governors in general, and like that of Servants to their Maſters, *not only to the good and gentle, but alſo to the froward*, and chiefly

* *As he does alſo* p. 110, 111, *of his* Vindication.

upon

upon account of their Divine Commiſſion ; ſo I muſt freely own, I can find nothing in all Mr. *H.* offers to the contrary, that is any manner of Diſproof of it.

CHAP. III.

Whether the Higher Powers are from God, only ſo far as they act agreeably to his Will, and ſtudy to promote the Happineſs of humane Society ?

I Proceed now to Mr. *H*'s. Third Poſition, namely, That *theſe Higher Powers are from God*, [that is to ſay, only] *as they act agreeably to his Will, which is, that they ſhould promote the Happineſs and Good of humane Society, which St.* Paul *all along ſuppoſes them to do. And conſequently, when they do the contrary, they cannot be ſaid to be from God, or to act by his Authority, any more than an inferior Magiſtrate may be ſaid to act by a Prince's Authority, whilſt he acts directly contrary to his Will.* Here is the ſame Miſtake I have before taken Notice of, namely by confounding God's Ordinance, and the Exerciſe, or rather the Abuſe of Authority. The Ruler is *God's Ordinance*, and derives his Authority from him. This Mr. *H.* does not pretend to deny. Only becauſe the Prince's Authority is given him, for the Good, and Safety, and Welfare of the Community, therefore he ceaſes in Mr. *H*'s. Opinion to be any longer God's Ordinance, or to have any farther Authority from him, when once he ceaſes to Govern as he ought.

But

But now (not to insist upon the Authorities of great Men, such as * *Origen*, † St. *Ambrose*, and ‖ St. *Jerome*) where is the Consequence of this? St. *Paul*, I am sure, says no such Thing; nor will Mr. *H.* be able to prove it by any other Medium. Husband and Wife are united in Matrimony, amongst other Purposes, for the mutual Society and Comfort of each other. But suppose the Effect prove otherwise, and they become mutual Crosses and Vexations to one another, they do not hereby cease to be Man and Wife. St. *Paul* commands all married Men, to be tender and loving to their Wives, as our Saviour loved his Church, and to cherish them as their own Flesh, and not be cross and peevish towards them.

---

* Dicet fortasse aliquis; Quid ergo? Et illa potestas quæ Dei servos persequitur, fidem impugnat, religionem subvertit, à Deo est? Ad hoc breviter respondebimus. Nemo est qui nesciat, quoniam & visus nobis à Deo donatus est, & auditus & sensus. Cum ergo hæc à Deo in potestate nostrâ sint, tamen uti visu vel ad bona vel ad mala possumus: Similiter & auditu, & motu manuum, & cogitatione sensûs: Et in hoc justum judicium Dei est, quoniam his quos ad usus ille bonos dedit, nos abutimur ad impia & iniqua ministeria. Ita ergo & potestas omnis à Deo data est, ad vindictam quidem malorum, laudem vero bonorum, sicutidem Apostolus in subsequentibus dicit. Erit autem justum judicium Dei erga eos qui acceptam potestatem secundum suas impietates, & non secundum divinas temperant leges. *Orig. in Ep. ad Rom.* cap. 13. lib. 9. ex Edit. *Io. Parv.*

† A Deo potestatum ordinatio, à malo ambitio potestatis. —— *Non est*, inquit, *potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinatæ sunt:* Non datæ, sed ordinatæ. Et *qui resistit potestati, Dei*, inquit, *ordinationi resistit.* —— Nec potestas mala, sed is qui malè utitur potestate. B. *Ambros.* Comment. lib. 4. in *Evang. Lu.* cap. 4.

‖ Si de seculi potestatibus dicere videatur, non ideo justæ erunt, etiamsi a Deo exordium acceperunt; secundum desiderium unius cujusque dantur. Nam dicit Salomon; *quoniam data est nobis potestas à Deo. Sed cum essetis ministri regni illius, non rectè judicâstis. Horrendè & cito apparebit vobis*, &c. *B. Hieron. in loc.*

† *Hus-*

* *Husbands*, says the Apostle, *love your Wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word: That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without Blemish. So ought Men to love their Wives, as their own Bodies; he that loveth his Wife, loveth himself. For no Man ever yet hated his own Flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the Church. For we are Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones. For this Cause shall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and be joined to his Wife, and they two shall be one Flesh. This is a great Mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his Wife, even as himself.* And at another time, says the same Apostle, † *Husbands love your Wives, and be not bitter against them.* And other Places there are in Scripture, where the Duty of Husbands is inculcated, and which they cannot disobey without contradicting the Ends of their Matrimony. Yet cannot Mr. *H.* say, that those who do so, are not the Husbands the Apostle speaks of, and therefore the Wife is at Liberty, whensoever she meets with a cross, vexatious, unkind, turbulent, and surly Husband, to shake him off, and be married to another. Yet the Case is exactly parallel, saving that the Husband, is not so till he has stipulated with the Wife, in a very solemn Manner, before God and the Congregation, to perform what is thus required of him, and they have been joined together by the Priest, according to God's holy Ordinance. Whereas no Stipulation is required to constitute a King, who is as much so before Coronation, or any Oath taken, as afterwards; and tho' he be never Crowned at all, and so, have never, during all his Reign, entred into any formal Obligation to his People. So that the Obligation is plainer and more conspicuous on the

* *Eph.* 5. 25, &c. † *Col.* 3. 19.

Hus-

Husband's Side, than on the Prince's; and if the Violation hereof does not hinder the one to be a Husband, why must it then make the other cease to be a Prince?

There is a Case, I grant; that of Adultery, which our * Saviour allows to be a just Cause of dissolving the Conjugal Bond. And when Mr. *H.* can produce any like Exception, as to the Sovereignty of the Prince, I will readily yield him to have Reason on his Side. But 'till then I hope he will excuse me, if I believe the Sovereign's Misgovernment does no more dissolve the mutual Relation, that is betwixt Himself and his People, than Adultery would have dissolved the Matrimonial Relation, supposing our Saviour had made no more Exception to that, than he has done to any other Difference that may happen between the married Couple.

Thus Servants are enjoin'd by our Apostle, † to be *obedient to their Masters according to the Flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of Heart, as unto Christ*, &c. And their Masters are required on the other hand, to do good Offices to their Servants, being favourable and gentle towards them, considering the Relation they both stand in to the Almighty God. ‖ *Ye Masters, do the same things to them, forbearing threatning, knowing that your Master also is in Heaven, neither is there respect of Persons with him.* Now when Masters answer this Obligation, there is no manner of Doubt, but their Servants are engaged to shew all Fidelity towards them, to be obedient to their Commands, and carefully perform the Work they are retained for. But does it hence follow on the other hand, that if the Master does not *forbear threatning*, if he does not *do the same things to his Servants*, but uses them ill, is churlish and harsh, and very difficult to be pleased by all their heartiest Endeavours to serve him, that this

* *Mat.* 5. 32. † *Eph.* 6, 5, 6, 7, 8. *Col.* 3. 22, 23, 24. *Tit.* 2. 9. 10. ‖ *Eph.* 6. 9.

is *not the* Master *St. Paul* describes; (for he declares him to be one that must use his Servants well, and particularly must *forbear Threatning*) *and consequently not the* Master *to whom he here presses Obedience*, and therefore the Servants may conspire together to turn him out of Doors, at least may bid him Defiance and refuse to serve him any longer? According to Mr. *H*'s. *Casuistry*, * it must be so, and Servants are highly to blame if they do not shake off their Master's Yoke, and set themselves free. † *A Passive-Non-Resistance would appear upon Examination, if* Mr. *H.* may determine the Case, *to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* And yet not only St. *Paul* says no such thing, in all he at any Time discourses of the Duty of Masters and Servants; but besides, St. *Peter* declares himself of a quite contrary Judgment, commanding Submission and Obedience even to these unworthy Masters; tho' not for their own, yet for God's Sake, and out of respect to his Injunction, after the same manner as St. *Paul* teaches Subjection to bad Governors, not upon their own Account, but because they are the Ordinance of God. His Words are these; ‖ *Servants, be subject to your Masters, with all Fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thank-worthy, if a Man for Conscience toward God endure Grief, suffering wrongfully. For what Glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your Faults, ye take it patiently? but if when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.* Words so full and clear, and so unquestionable a Confutation of that Sense of St. *Paul*'s fore-mention'd Injunctions, to which Mr. *H*'s. Method of interpreting would lead, that nothing could be more. In answer to this Mr. *H.* argues, ‡ *that St.* Peter *advises* Slaves, *who were in a State of perfect Captivity, had forfeited their Lives, and were bought with a Price into the Arbitrary Power of their* Masters, *to bear with the evil Treat-*

* *Vindicat.* p. 21. † *Serm.* p. 8. ‖ 1 *Pet.* 2. 18, 19, 20. ‡ P. 128. 129.

ment

ment of their Masters, &c. *Whereas* Subjects *generally speaking, are not in a State of Captivity, never forfeited their Lives and Fortunes to their Prince, nor ever were bought with a Price into their Arbitrary Power.* And this is to pass for an Answer to what is alledged from St. *Peter*, and Mr. *H.* thinks it *very unreasonable* that it should not be thought a good one. But sure he has not quite forgot that there are other Servants besides Slaves; nor can he deny that they are concerned in this Injunction of the Apostle. Let him therefore reflect upon this, and then tell us whether the Cases be so different, as he would have it thought they are.

But it is not only in the fore-mentioned Instances, but Multitudes of others that might be produced, where an Institution is not vacated by the ill Management of the Person entrusted with it. If a General, instead of fighting the Enemy, spends his Time in plundering, abusing, and tyrannizing over his Friends, and committing all Sorts of Outrages, none can deny that he deserves to be severely punished for such abominable Misbehaviour; yet all this does not hinder his being a General, nor discharge his Soldiers from obeying his lawful Orders, till his Command shall be taken from him.

The Case is the same also with a Judge, who is appointed for the Good of the People, that he may do right to the Injured, may preserve Peace, and punish Malefactors. For be he never so partial and unjust in his Decisions of whatsoever kind, tho' this makes a corrupt Judge, and justly deserving to be displaced, and called to account for his Proceedings, yet so long as he continues in Commission, he is still a Judge, tho' a very bad one, and his Determinations are all valid in Law, till reversed by some other Sentence.

The Lord Mayor, no one doubts, is chosen for the Good of the City, and acts under his Sovereign to this End, and is * sworn faithfully to discharge his Office accordingly; yet be his Administration ever

* *Book of Oaths*, p. 253.

ſo bad, and ever ſo much Diſorder be occaſioned by it; this does not put an End to his Mayoralty, till he ſhall be legally diſpoſſeſs'd of it.

And yet to come nearer home, I ſhall add one other familiar Inſtance. Mr. *H.* at his Ordination undertook to * *give faithful Diligence, always ſo to miniſter the Doctrine, and Sacraments, and Diſcipline of Chriſt, as the Lord hath commanded, and as the Church and Realm hath received the ſame, according to the Commandments of God; and to baniſh and drive away all erroneous and ſtrange Doctrines, contrary to God's Word.* And theſe were Conditions whereupon he was admitted to his ſacred Office, and as much incumbent upon him, as to promote the publick Welfare, and be a *Miniſter of God* to the People *for good*, and *a Terror to evil Doers*, is upon the Magiſtrate. And to this End likewiſe he was inſtituted into his Pariſh of St. *Peter the Poor*. And if however it ſhall be found, that he has acted contrary to the Deſign of his Promotion, by broaching and endeavouring to defend, inſtead of condemning, oppoſing, and uſing his hearty Endeavours, to ſuppreſs erroneous Doctrines, and particularly in the Caſe now under Debate, will he own it to be a good Conſequence, that he is not the Prieſt whom the Ordinal takes him to be, nor the Rector the Biſhop expected him to be, and therefore he is no Prieſt of God, and ſo all his Adminiſtrations null and deluſory, or that he is no longer Rector of the ſaid Pariſh, nor any of the Pariſhioners to own him as ſuch, or to pay him their Tithes? I cannot find out a Difference betwixt this way of arguing, and his own; nor any Reaſon, why a wicked Ruler ſhould not ſtill remain *God's Ordinance*, how unworthy ſoever of ſo high an Honour, as well as Mr. *H.* remains a Pariſh-Prieſt upon this Suppoſition. And he muſt therefore either quit his Rectory, and lay aſide his Orders, or renounce this

* *See Form and Manner of ordaining Prieſts.*

his

his beloved Notion. For to use his own * Argument, he is a Minister, and Minister of that Parish in particular, *as he acts agreeably to God's Will, which is,* that he should take Care to *minister that Doctrine,* &c. *which the Lord hath commanded, and this Church and Realm hath received. And consequently when he does the contrary, he cannot be said* to be God's Priest, *or to act by his* Commission, *any more than an inferiour Magistrate may be said to act by his Prince's Authority, whilst he acts directly contrary to his Will.* For *as far as he deflects from* God's *Will, so far he loses his Title* to his sacred Character and Office. Into this Dilemma Mr. *H.* has undoubtedly brought himself, supposing his Doctrine prove false: And here therefore, I leave it to his own Ingenuity to extricate himself, as well as he can, and proceed to what follows.

No Prince, says Mr. *H. surely will own him for his Viceroy, who being sent into a Province to do Justice, sets himself to do all the Injustice possible.* Where if he had said, no Prince who sends a Viceroy on Purpose to do Justice, will continue him any longer in his Office, when it comes to be known that he employs his Power to do all the Injustice he can, this were a reasonable Assertion, and what any one must assent to. But that the *Prince will not own him for his Viceroy* whilst he is so, whilst he bears his Character, and has his Commission to act by, if he would pursue the Design of it, is a new Discovery, and it is fit Mr. *H.* should be allowed the Honour of having first hit upon it.

But he offers to prove it too. And in truth, his Discovery, and his Argument for the Proof of it, are so well suited to each other, that it is great Pity they should be parted. And therefore I shall here subjoin it in his own Words, † *He who acts farther than his Commission bears him out, is not in those Actions his Prince's Viceroy, because it is the Commission only that makes him so, and in these Actions he is without Com-*

* *Vindicat.* p. 24. † Ibid. *p.* 26.

miſſion. As if he had no Commiſſion at all from his Prince, becauſe he has none for his Injuſtice. But how doth this appear? This is a good Proof that the Miſcarriages of the Viceroy lie all upon himſelf, and no way affect his Prince, who expected none of them, and is not therefore chargeable with them. But how does it follow, that the Viceroy is not ſtill Viceroy, till his Commiſſion is revoked? Which was the Point Mr. *H.* undertook to aſſert; or that being Viceroy, he was not to have all the Obedience paid him that is due to all that are ſo? Which was intended to be implied; and which the following Words apply, tho' without any good Reaſon for it, to a Sovereign Prince, whom he will not allow to be God's Viceroy, and accountable to him only as ſuch, becauſe there are certain Caſes, and poſſibly of dangerous Conſequence, wherein he acts unagreeably to the Truſt repoſed in him, and the high Character he bears.

But Mr. *H.* tells us in another Place, that * *He* [S. *Paul*] *hath his Eye all the way upon the End of Government, and founds his Precepts upon this Suppoſition, that the* Rulers *anſwer that good End. If they do not; or if they ſet themſelves to contradict it by Oppreſſion, Violence, and Injuſtice, by invading and deſtroying the publick Happineſs, and by bringing on publick Miſeries; the Apoſtle ſeems not to think of recommending Submiſſion to the Subject,* &c. But to whom doth this ſeem? To Mr. *H.* perhaps, and ſuch as are reſolved to ſee but on one Side. But would he be prevailed with, ſeriouſly and impartially to conſider his Text, I am verily perſuaded, the Apoſtle would more than ſeem to recommend Subjection to all lawful Sovereigns whatſoever; and not only ſo, but to enforce it with no leſs a Penalty, than eternal *Damnation* to ſuch as ſhall reſiſt them. The Words are ſo very plain, that by whatſoever Artifice the Force of them can be evaded, by the ſame Way any other Denunciation in

* *Serm.* p. 9.

Scrip-

Scripture may be made of none Effect. And could Mr. *H.* have found in his Heart, to have tried his Skill in the Defence of Image-Worſhip, Duels, or Fornication, as contradictory as they are to the Second, Sixth and Seventh Commandment, he might as eaſily have performed that Undertaking, and proved each of theſe to be according to Scripture, as he can prove the Apoſtle not to have thought *of recommending Submiſſion to bad Governors*, in his Text, whenſoever it ſhall pleaſe God to ſet ſuch over us. The Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Benefits of Government, for encouraging to the more chearful Obedience to Authority; but that he had ſuch *an Eye upon the End of Government*, as to make that the ſole, or indeed the chief Ground of Submiſſion to Governors, is what Mr. *H.* has not yet proved, nor will ever be able to do it. And yet if he could have done what is thus impoſſible, it would not have been enough to anſwer his Deſign. For he has already been told, * that *God gives a Man Riches and Honour*, as well as Power, not only for his own Sake but for the Good of others, and that he is to uſe them accordingly for the Relief, and Aſſiſtance, and Benefit of his Neighbours, and by no means to their Oppreſſion and Wrong. Yet if he abuſe the Advantages he enjoys above thoſe round about him to theſe ill Purpoſes, he does not thereupon forfeit his Eſtate and Title to them. And Mr. *H.* would have done well to ſhew how the ſupream Power comes to be more forfeitable than theſe.

He adds, † *Some ſay that St.* Paul *calls* Nero, *who was a Monſter of Wickedneſs, and exerciſed the greateſt Cruelties and Barbarities, the Miniſter of God, even in the Execution of all his Villanies*; and then *prays God to forgive thoſe who ſay ſo.* Which Words may either mean, as he ſeems to have intended them, that *Nero* acted all his Outrages in Purſuance of his Commiſſion from Almighty God; and then I know not who it is Mr. *H.* prays for; I am ſure I cannot find it in the

* *Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject*, p. 12. † *P.* 26.

Enquiry referred to in the Margin. And I believe Mr. *H.* will be hard put to it, to name any other Author on whom he can fairly fix this Charge. Or elſe the Words may mean, that *Nero* had God's Commiſſion, and was *God's Miniſter*, whilſt he acted ſo very unagreeably to his Station. And if this be the right expoſition of them, I am apt to think that I may come into the Number of thoſe, for whom Mr. *H.* is ſo charitable an Interceſſor. I cannot pretend to determine, * whether the Epiſtle to the *Romans* was written in *Nero's* Reign, or his Predeceſſor *Claudius's*; nor is it much Material in which, they being both bad enough: But whether-ſoever of them was then in the Throne, it is very hard to imagine how Mr. *H.* will be able to make it out that he was not at that time the *Higher Power*. And if this be once granted, it will be very eaſie to ſhew

rt. 2.

---

* Corintho Scriptam fuiſſe inſignem illam ad Romanos Epiſtolam, An. Per. Jul. 4773. Ær. Chriſt. 60; (*i. e. Neronis Sexto.*) Uſſer. Annal. To. poſter. p. 674. Paulus Corintho ſcribit Epiſtolam ad Romanos. *Pearſon.* Annal. Paulin. Chriſt. 57. Ner. 3. Il écrivit la lettre aux Romains vers la fin da l'annee 57, ou au commencement de la 58 de nôtre ere. *Du Pin* Diſſert. Prelim. ſur la Bible, Part. 2. Sect 8. p. 48. et Diſſert. Prelim. ſur les Autheurs des livres de la Bible. Sect. 5. p. 67. Epiſt. ad Rom. an. 54 ſcripta. Cav. hiſt. liter. p. 6. Ann. 4005 poſt Chr. 56, ſcripſit Epiſtolam ad Romanos. *Seth. Calviſ.* Op. Chronol. p. 448. Chriſti 58. Neronis ſecundo. Origenes eam Epiſtolam apud Corinthum Scriptam eſſe concludit, cui nos etiam aſſentimur. *Baron.* Annal. 58. n. 46. *From* Corinth *in his ſhort ſtay there, he writeth the Epiſtle to the* Romans, *as hath been well ſuppoſed*, &c. *Chr.* 56. *Ner.* 2. Lightfoot *Harm. of N. Teſt.* Act. ch. 20. *Coming again to* Corinth, *he wrote this to the* Romans, *a little before the Emperor* Claudius's *Death*,† *Dr.* Hammond *Annot. on the Title to the* Rom. *This is commonly acknowledged to have been written under the Reign of* Nero. *Dr.* Falkner *of Chriſtian Loyalty, L. 2. C. 4. It muſt be written* A. D. 57. *the Fourth year of* Nero. *Dr.* Whitby. 57 or 58. Bp Lloyd.

† wch is placed by Chronologers in the 55th year of Christ.

him

him from St. *Paul*, that the ſame was the *Ordinance of God.* Nor is it poſſible, without great Violence and Diſtortion, to put any Interpretation upon the Apoſtle's Words, *There is no Power but of God, and the Powers that be are ordain'd of God*, that ſhall not include the Emperor then upon the Throne.

Mr. *H.* ſeems to lay a great deal of ſtreſs * upon our Saviour's calling *Herod* Fox, and St. *Paul*'s ſaying he *was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion*; as if they accounted *Oppreſſive* and *Perſecuting Governors*, ſo far from *acting by God's Authority*, as that they were *to be looked upon as degenerated into the worſt of Beaſts.* Here our Saviour Repreſents *Herod*'s Subtilty by that of a *Fox*, and St. *Paul* the Emperor's Cruelty by that of a *Lyon*; and this muſt be taken for a Proof that they were no longer *God's Ordinance*; becauſe they abuſed the Power committed to them, and thereby deſerv'd theſe hard Names. This I grant, ſhewed they were to be looked upon as bad Governors; but not as no Governors at all. Sure Arguments run very low, when ſuch as theſe have ſo much weight laid upon them. *One would think*, ſays Mr. *H. That it was their Opinion, that the* Lion *and* Fox *had as much real* Authority, *to commit their Depredations, as a Cunning and Powerful Prince hath to act his Violences.* A very Rational Inference! A Bad Governor cannot be like either of theſe Beaſts in Subtilty or Rapine, but he muſt inevitably have as little of Authority as they. As neceſſary a Conſequence as that *Tenterdon* Steeple made *Goodwyn* Sands.

I ſhall take notice of nothing more under this Head, but only his unhandſom Reflection upon *David*'s Carriage towards *Saul*, and another (whether meer Calumny or not, I deſire him ſeriouſly to conſider) upon the Writers in behalf of Non-reſiſtance. † *David*, he pleads, *oppoſed Saul at the Hazard of the Public Peace.* And yet we do not find the leaſt Violence attempted by him againſt his Sovereign,

* *P.* 27, 28. † *P.* 28.

though

though himself appointed by God to Succeed him in the Government. Mr. *H.* * had been told, if he would have been pleas'd to take Notice of it, what might have silenc'd him as to this Plea, and the rather because coming with the Authority of a *Reverend Prelate*, for whom I hope he has no mean Regard, it being in the words of the Lord Bishop of *Sarum*, *that* Saul *was at first Constituted King by* Samuel, *acting in the Name of the Lord: And when he had Reigned Two years, the same* Samuel, *in the Name of the same God, before the same People, denounces Publickly that his Kingdom should not continue*; *and that God had* sought a Man after his own Heart, *because he invaded the Priests Office. After this, he limits a certain day*; *He tells him*, This day the Lord hath rent the Kingdom of *Israel* from thee, and given it to thy Neighbour; because of his Rebellion against God *in the case of* Amalek. *The Pretence of Failure and Forfeiture can go no higher. Now for the pretences of* David *to step into his Government, and to wrest it from him. He was anointed by* Samuel, *for ought appears, without Reservation for the Life of* Saul. *He was qualified for Government*, a Valiant Man, a Man of War, Prudent in Matters, a comely Person, and the Lord was with him. *He had received Testimony from God of his Election. The Spirit of God departed from* Saul, *and rested upon him. He had Power in his hand, he was set* over the Men of War, accepted by all the People, *All* Israel *and* Judea *loved him. After all this, you know his Provocations, his Advantages, and his Behaviour. He durst not touch the* Lord's Anointed. *And when another pretended to have done it at* Saul's *entreaty* in extremis, *he revenged his Death and lamented over him. Ye Mountains of Gilboa*, &c. Whereto I shall add the words of the Learned Bishop *Stillingfleet*; † David *himself, though anointed to be King, Persecuted by* Saul, *and though he might have pleaded* Necessity *and*

* *St.* Paul, *no mover of Sedition*, *P.* 15. 16.

† *Serm.* 7. *P.* 110.

Pro-

Providence, *as much as any ever could, (when* Saul *was ſtrangely deliver'd in his hands) yet we ſee what an Opinion he had of the Perſon of a bad King;* † The Lord forbid that I ſhould do this thing againſt my Maſter, the Lord's Anointed, to ſtretch forth my hand againſt him, ſeeing he is the Anointed of the Lord. *And leſt we ſhould think, it was only his* Modeſty *or his* Policy *which kept him from doing it, he afterwards upon a like occaſion declares, it was only the Sin of doing it, which kept him from it.* ‡ *For who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed and be guiltleſs?* His Heart ſmote him ‖ for but cutting off the Skirt of *Saul*'s Garment, in the Wilderneſs of *Engedi*, when he had him at an advantage, that ſeemed to be put into his hand by a particular Providence, and he could as eaſily have killed him if he durſt. And when it pleas'd God a Second time to deliver *Saul* in like manner into his Hand, as he lay aſleep in his Trench, and *Abiſhai* would have invited him to hearken to the call of ſo extraordinary a Providence, and avenge himſelf of ſo implacable an Enemy, *David* conſider'd, though he was his Enemy, yet he was his Sovereign too, and would by no means do him any harm. * *Abiſhai ſaid to David,* † *God hath deliver'd thine Enemy into thine*

† 1 *Sam.* 24. 6. ‡ 1 *Sam.* 26. 9. ‖ 1 *Sam.* 24. 4.
* 1 *Sam.* 26. 8, 9, 10, 11.

† Abiſhai *would fain have Perſwaded him to it. And it was ſaid to him, upon a like Occaſion,* Behold the Day, of which the Lord hath ſaid unto thee, I will deliver thine Enemy into thy Hand, that thou mayſt do to him, as it ſhall ſeem good unto thee. *Would not a Whigg have thought this a full* Commiſſion? *And a Contempt of* Providence *to neglect the* Opportunity? *And it was* God *himſelf who gave that* Opportunity, *by cauſing a* Deep Sleep *to fall upon them. And it ſeems there was a* Propheſy *of this given to* David, *for it is ſaid,* Behold the Day, of which the Lord ſaid unto thee— *But* David *thought, not even a* Propheſy, *no nor the Act of* God *in cauſing a* Deep Sleep *to fall on his* Enemy, *would*

warrant his taking that Opportunity *to* Reſiſt *his* Prince, *or thoſe* Commiſſion'd *by him. It might be a* Trial *to* David, *to ſee if his* Loyalty *could be* ſhaken; *And for an* Example *to future* Ages. *And* David *did thus Determine it*, &c. The Good old Cauſe Diſcuſſed, *P.* 11, 12.

thine hand this Day; now therefore I pray thee let me ſmite him with the Spear, even to the Earth at once, and I will not ſmite him the ſecond time. * *And David ſaid to Abiſhai, deſtroy him not; for who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed and be guiltleſs? David ſaid furthermore, as the Lord liveth, the Lord ſhall ſmite him, or his day ſhall come to die, or he ſhall deſcend into the Battel and Periſh. The Lord forbid that I ſhould ſtretch forth mine hand to deſtroy the Lord's anointed.* And afterwards † when the *Amalekite* came to bring him the news of *Saul*'s Death, in expectation no doubt of a bountiful Reward for the glad tidings of *David*'s Deliverance from ſo bitter an Enemy, and that the Kingdom was now devolv'd upon him, yet forasmuch as he owned himſelf to have been an Inſtrument of Compleating the Death of *Saul*, tho' not till he had firſt fallen upon his Spear, ſee how like one that had been a moſt Faithful Subject, *David* reſents this Uſage of *Saul*, though from an Alien, who owed him no Natural Allegiance; ‡ *David took hold on his Clothes and rent them, and likewiſe all the Men that were with him, and they mourned and wept, and faſted until Even.* ‖ *And David called one of the young Men, and ſaid, go near and fall upon him. And he ſmote him that he died. And David ſaid unto him, Thy Blood be upon thy head, for thy Mouth hath teſtified againſt thee, ſaying, I have ſlain the Lord's anointed.* This was *David*'s Dutiful Carriage towards *Saul*, notwithſtanding all the ill uſage he had met with from him, and

* Οὐ μόνον αὐτὸς οὐχ ἥψατο τῦ πολεμίυ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερος βελομένυς ἐκώλυσε, σωματοφύλαξ ἀντὶ πολεμίυ γενόμενος, καὶ δορυφόρος ἄριστος. *B. Chryſoſt.* εἰς τ Δαβὶδ καὶ τὸν Σαὺλ. λόγ. β. † 2 *Sam.* 1. 4. ‡ *V.* 11, 12. ‖ *V.* 15, 16.

not-

notwithstanding the Character himself bare at that time, of a more than ordinary Person, because expresly design'd by Almighty God, for the Government of his People *Israel*. And I should be glad to know of Mr. *H.* whether such a Harmless Deportment towards a Cruel and Persecuting King be all the Opposition he pleads for. If it be, this will never answer his aim, of promoting the *Public Good*, by easing the Community of a Tyrannical, Imperious, and Destructive Governor. And if it be not, as it is plain enough it is not, his introducing *David* here as an example of the Resistance he contends for, can serve to no other end, than meerly to amuze the unwary Reader, by offering something he would have thought to the purpose, when it is not.

Yet says Mr. *H.* * *If his* [a Subject's] *single Life is unjustly sought after, if he should fly about with a Body of armed Men, and defend him from all who would attack him, I cannot say but he hath* David's *example to bear him out, who Opposed* Saul *in a single instance of Injustice, at the hazard of the Public Peace.* Whereas I have shewn that *David* would *do no Mischief to* Saul. And if he had a Body of Soldiers about him for his Guard, against the attempts of any that might Privily seek to take away his Life, this however will warrant none other to do the like, who is not so immediately chosen by Godhimself, and anointed to be a Governor as hewas. Or if Mr. *H.* thinks it would, this would justifie any Subject whatsoever, that apprehends himself in Danger from his Prince, in betaking himself to Arms: And so we should have the World brought to a fine pass.

Again, Mr. *H.* affirms, † that *the* Cause *between* Saul *and* David *being purely Personal, and of a Private Concern; and the Charge against* Saul *relating meerly to his Personal Vices, all that can follow from hence, supposing the* Example of David *to oblige our* Consciences, *is this, That it is not lawful for* Subjects *to dethrone or murder* a Prince, *for Vices meerly* personal, *or on any*

* *Vind. p.* 21. † *P.* 165, 166.

account

account of a private Nature. But let Mr. *H.* ſpeak out. Is this all? Were *Saul*'s Faults meerly perſonal? Was not his Management ſuch as * had provoked God to caſt him off, and appoint another to ſucceed him? If Mr. *H.* could have ſaid ſo much of any modern Prince, how would he have triumphed over any one that ſhould have pretended to ſay, that he was irreſiſtible, and had not loſt all the Authority he could ever be pretended to have received from God? But this is not all. For *Secondly*, *David* was the Perſon † pitched upon by God himſelf, and by his immediate Direction anointed to this Purpoſe: And being ſo, was now become a publick Perſon, and ſo the whole Nation concerned in his Welfare and Safety; And an Attempt to take him off, was therefore an Endeavour to deſtroy the *publick Happineſs.* Which according to Mr. *H.* was certainly contrary to the Obligations all Princes are under, and was in his Senſe a Forfeiture of his Station, and of all the Allegiance that had been due to him. Once more, *Thirdly*, Was *Saul*'s Enmity to *David* all his Fault? By no means. For ‖ he had wickedly murder'd near a hundred of *the Prieſts, and their City* Nob, *both Men and Women, Children and Sucklings, and Oxen, and Aſſes, and Sheep with the edge of the Sword.* And was not this a Deſtruction of *the publick Welfare?* At leaſt, did this ſhew *Saul* to have been a *terror to evil Works, and a Rewarder of the Good?* And did he *continually attend upon this very thing?* This is no Sign that he did. And yet if he did not, I know not how Mr. *H.* according to his Principles can maintain, ‡ that he had not loſt all his Authority, and ſo might be lawfully reſiſted; and by Conſequence how he will prove, that *all that can follow from hence, ſuppoſing* David's *Example to oblige our* Conſciences, *is, that it is not lawful for* Subjects, *to endeavour to dethrone or murder a* Prince, *for Vices meerly* Perſonal, *or on any account of a private Nature.* For this is not all that follows from hence. But *ſuppoſing* David's *Exam-*

* 1 *Sam.* 15. 23. † 1 *Sam.* 16. 12, 13. ‖ 1 *Sam.* 22. 19.
‡ *See* p. 52.

ple

ple obligatory, it follows that it is not lawful to oppose a Prince rejected by God, and an Enemy to good Works, and the publick Happiness. *Which is not agreeable as Mr.* H. *boasts, but contrary to what he has taught.* But it was what *David* thought, and practis'd, and for which I must take the Liberty to say, notwithstanding what Mr. *H.* has offered to the contrary, our Church has in her Homilies against Rebellion, recommended him as a Pattern for our *Passive* Imitation. And St. *Chrysostom* applauds him to a great Degree for it, declaring that he ascended the Throne with abundantly the greater Glory, when his Time came, because he had behaved himself so patiently and loyally before. ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἔτυχε καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἁγλαβῶς, καὶ τῇ χειρὶ ἀκηλύνῃ, &c. * *Behold he received the Kingdom with unpolluted Hands; he put on his Crown with an undefiled right hand, he was advanced to the Throne with a Reputation that outshone all the Lustre of the Purple and the Diadem, by reason of his having spared his Enemy, and so mournfully lamented his Fall. For which he was not only honoured during his Life, but his Memory was precious after his Death.* And thus he recommends him to the Imitation of all good Christians. † " *Wherefore, O Man,* " *if thou desirest either to be lastingly glorious here, or* " *eternally happy hereafter, imitate the Vertue of this* " *just Man, diligently follow his Example, and let thy* " *Carriage shew forth the like Patience with his, that* " *having endured the like Conflicts with him, thou may'st* " *attain to the same Bliss and Happiness.*

But I return to Mr. *H.* who charges some nameless Persons ‖ with condemning *David*, and contradicting the *Homilies*, in Defence of the Cause of Non-resistance; whereas it is evident they need do neither. And for my own Part I profess, I know none that does it, and I am perswaded moreover that none who speak at all to the purpose, can do it; the Homilies are so designedly calculated for inculcating the Necessity of this Passive Duty. If Mr. *H.* thinks he knows

* Εἰς τὸν Δαβὶδ καὶ τὸν Σαὺλ. λόγ. β. † *Ibid.* ‖ P. 29.

any

any that have done it, he would have done well to have named them, and call'd upon them to vindicate themselves. Which were a much fairer Method of Procedure, than to quarrel with an *Individuum Vagum*, and whom in all probability, upon the strictest enquiry he can make, he will never be able to find.

It is no good sign of Mr. *H*'s being satisfied of the Goodness of his Cause, wherein he has yet so heartily embarked, that he seeks to maintain it by such improper Arguments; producing *David* as a Pattern of Resistance, who was so careful to avoid all Violence to his Prince; and charging his Opponents with contradicting the Homilies of our Church, in a Point wherein it is not easie for them to do it; but himself manifestly does it. As the Reader may easily observe from what follows, out of the Second Homily against Rebellion.

Yet would David neither himself slay nor hurt such an Enemy, for that he was his Prince, and Lord; nor would suffer any other to kill, hurt, or lay hand upon him, when he might have been slain without any stir, tumult, or danger of any Man's Life. Now let David answer to such demands, as Men desirous of Rebellion do use to make. Shall not we, especially being so good Men as we are, rise, and rebel against a Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy, and therefore like not to prosper either in War or Peace, but to be hurtful and Pernicious to the Commonwealth? No, saith Good and Godly David, God's and such a King's Faithful Subject: And so convicting such Subjects as attempt any Rebellion against such a King, to be neither Good Subjects, nor Good Men. But say they, Shall we not Rise and Rebel against so unkind a Prince, nothing considering, or regarding our True, Faithful, and

Painful

Painful Service, or the safeguard of our Posterity? No! saith Good David, whom no Unkindness could cause to forsake his due Obedience to his Sovereign. Shall we not, say they, Rise, and Rebel against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy, that seeketh our Lives? No, saith godly David, who had learned the Lesson that our Saviour afterwards plainly taught, That we should do no hurt to our Fellow Subjects, though they hate us, and are our Enemies; much less unto our Prince, though he were our Enemy. Shall we not assemble an Army of such good Fellows as we are, and by hazarding of our Lives, and the Lives of such as shall withstand us, and withal hazarding the whole estate of our Countrey, remove so naughty a Prince? No, saith godly David; for I when I might without assembling Force, or number of men, without tumult or hazard of any Man's Life, or shedding of any drop of Blood, have delivered my self, and my Country of an evil Prince, yet would I not do it. Are not they (say some) lusty, and courageous Captains, valiant men of Stomach, and good mens Bodies, that do venture by force to kill and depose their King, being a Naughty Prince, and their Mortal Enemy? They may be as lusty and courageous as they list, yet saith Godly David, they can be no Good, or Godly men that so do: For I not only have rebuked, but also Commanded him to be slain as a Wicked Man, which slew King Saul mine Enemy, though he being weary of his Life for the loss of the Victory against his Enemies, desired that Man to slay him. What shall we

then do to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us, hated of God, hurtful to the Commonwealth? &c. Lay no violent hand upon him, saith good David, but let him live untill God appoint, and work his end, either by Natural Death, or in War by lawful Enemies, not by Traiterous Subjects.

Thus would godly David make answer: And St. Paul, as ye heard before, willeth us also to pray for such a Prince. If King David would make these answers, as by his deeds and words recorded in the Holy Scriptures, indeed he doth make unto all such demands concerning Rebelling against Evil Princes, Unkind Princes, Cruel Princes, Princes that be to their Good Subjects mortal Enemies, Princes that are out of God's Favour, and so hurtful, or like to be hurtful to the Commonwealth: What answer think ye would he make to those that demand, whether they (being naughty and unkind Subjects) may not to the great hazard of the Life of many Thousands, and the utter danger of the State of the Commonwealth, and whole Realm, assemble a sort of Rebels, either to depose, or put in fear, or to destroy their natural and loving Princes? With a great deal more to the same purpose. And if this be on Mr. *H*'s side, it is impossible to tell what is against him, seeing nothing can be more directly so than this is. By which the Reader may please to observe Mr. *H*'s way of arguing; which is to pick out of a Discourse an Expression or two that he thinks he can strain to his purpose, and then lay the whole stress of the Controversie upon that, though in a diametrical opposition to the apparent Design of the whole.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Whether it be not only Innocent, but Honourable and Glorious, to rise up against a Prince, that attends not to the End of his Government?

MR. *H's.* Fourth Position is this; * *Tho' the Authority of the Prince in carrying forward the End of his Power, cannot be resisted without the highest Guilt; yet his Power in acting contrary to that End, may be opposed without the Shadow of a Crime; nay with Honour and Glory. This,* he tells us afterwards, † *is the principal Doctrine contained in his Sermon,* and it plainly appears to be what he chiefly aimed at establishing, that *supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society over which they are placed; it is lawful and glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.*

Now Opposition is twofold, either Civil and Legal, or Military and Coactive. It may be such as the Laws of God and Man allow of; I mean an Appeal to the Courts of Judicature, for the deciding of Differences and Redress of Grievances, so long as they are open, and the Subject may have the Benefit of them, and for the Punishment of evil Ministers, under a wilful tyrannical Prince. And would Mr. *H.* be content with this, I would allow him that it might be Innocent, and in some Cases Honourable. But there is another Sort of Opposition his Mind is set upon, and nothing less than open Violence will serve his Turn, by Force of Arms, or whatever other Course of illegal Resistance. This is what the Word ἀντιτάξεως most naturally imports, and what Mr. *H.* would have thought to be highly justifiable, whenever it is against a bad Governor, and who acts contrary to the *End of his Power.* Here he beats about the Bush, after an unusual rate, and complains of some that allow Resistance in some Cases, but are not willing to own they do; and besides will not allow it *honourable,* nor so

* *P.* 31. † *P.* 40.

much as *lawful*. How! Allow it in some Cases? And yet not allow it to be so much as lawful? This is somewhat odd. However if there be any such, I leave Mr. *H.* and them, to debate the Matter as they please, amongst themselves. My Business is only with Mr. *H.* who ought to have more substantially proved the *Lawfulness of Resistance*, before he had pretended it to be *Honourable*. And till he does this, I must beg his Pardon, if I believe it to be neither; because there has nothing yet been brought in Evidence for this Doctrine, but what I have shewn to come very short of Proof. If it be either *lawful* or *honourable* to break the Laws of God, and dishonour, perhaps expell and dethrone his Vicegerent, then the Resistance Mr. *H.* pleads for may lay a Claim to both these Epithets. But without such a favourable Concession, he is sadly at a loss, having yet said nothing that will convince an impartial Enquirer of the Lawfulness of it.

There were that pleaded it both *lawful and honourable* to oppose King *CHARLES* I. of blessed Memory, to raise Forces against him, to pursue him from Place to Place, and at last to seize him, imprison him, and arraign and try him before a pretended High-Court of Justice, a * Court where Reason was not to be hearkned to; and at length to murder him *in a most barbarous Manner, beyond the Example of former Ages.* A most horrid Fact! that Mr. *H.* professes, at least once every Year, solemnly to bewail and lament, and to implore the Mercy of Almighty God, for the Pardon of it. Yet there were, that would undertake to vindicate this outrageous Wickedness, and to represent it as effected not only *lawfully, but with Honour and Glory.* But it was not their vain Boasting, nor is it Mr. *H*'s in any other like Case, that will alter the Nature of Things, and make what is really heinous, and a crying Sin, to become no Sin at all; nay to commence virtuous and laudable. To be a Rebel or a Traitor, may be a Sign of Courage, and Resentment, but not of a meek and humble Spirit, or the tru-

---

* K. *Shew me the Court where Reason is not to be heard*, Bradshaw. *Sir, we will shew it you here.* Works of King *Charles* the Martyr, Edit. 1662. p. 434. *K. Shew me that Jurisdiction where Reason is not to be Heard. Bradshaw. Sr, We shew it you here, The Commons of England.* Phillips's Journal of y^e Court for y^e Trial of K. Cha. I. published by Dr Nalson, p. 45, 46.

ly patient and lowly Temper and Genius of Christianity; which is highly honourable and glorious, and the contrary whereto can upon no Terms be so.

Our Saviour would not so much as permit his Disciples St. *James* and St. *John* to call for Fire from Heaven, after the Example of *Elias*, upon a Village of the *Samaritans*, that would not receive him as he was going up to *Jerusalem*, but * *turned and rebuked them, and said, ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of.* You would do well to consider, *how opposite this exterminating Spirit is to the Design of my Coming*; as the Learned Dr. *Whitby* paraphrases upon the Words. And is it imaginable, that he will ever approve of the like furious Zeal against the *Higher Powers?* Or that according to his Doctrine of Patience and Submission, it can possibly be reputable, or indeed any way justifiable for others of his Followers, to rise up against their Sovereign, not for their Saviour's, but for their own Sake, and only for Fear of some temporal Mischief that might probably attend their Quiet and dutiful Submission, after his Example, and in Obedience to his Command? To transgress his Laws, for the Sake of any Worldly Advantage, can never be Matter of true Honour and Glory, whatsoever Pretences witty Men may frame for the doing of it. And Mr. *H.* may therefore have as much of this Honour as he can desire, without the Danger of being envied for it, by any who prefer the Salvation of their immortal Souls before the good Things of this short transitory Life. For my own Part, I cannot but think it incomparably greater Glory, to follow our blessed Saviour, *who was made perfect thro' Sufferings*, and that truly Christian Company of Martyrs and Confessors, who so manfully underwent the most barbarous Indignities and Tortures, and who, not by Resistance of their lawful Superiours, but † *thro' Faith and Patience inherited the Promises.*

For I am entirely of Arch-bishop *Usher*'s Opinion, that *God's Word is clear in the Point.* Whosoever resisteth, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation;

---

* *Luke* 9. 55. *Heb.* 6. 12. || *Power of the Prince*, p. 157.

and

and thereby a Neceſſity is impoſed upon us of being ſubject, even for Conſcience Sake; *which may not be avoided by the Pretext of any enſuing Miſchief whatſoever. For by this means we ſhould have Liberty given unto us, to* ſpeak Evil of the Law, and to judge the Law. But if thou judge the Law, thou art not a Doer of the Law, but a Judge, *ſaith St.* James. *It becomes us in Obedience to perform our Part; and leave the Ordering of Events to God, whoſe Part only that is.*

CHAP. V.

Whether the Publick Peace and Happineſs of Mankind be the ſole End of Government?

I Am now come to Mr. *H*'s. Fifth Poſition, * that *the Publick Peace and Happineſs of Mankind is the* ſole *End of Government, as well if it be appointed by God himſelf, as if it be purely of humane Inſtitution*; and again in other Terms, † *Submiſſion is due to Governors, not for their own Sake, but meerly for the Sake of* Publick Happineſs. Here I deſign theſe two things. 1. To prove that the *Publick Peace and Happineſs of Mankind is not the ſole End of Government.* And 2. To ſhew that if it were ſo, yet this would not anſwer Mr. *H*'s. Deſign of proving the Lawfulneſs of reſiſting the *higher Powers.*

1. I begin with the former of theſe, to prove that the *publick Peace and Happineſs of Mankind* is not the *ſole End of Government*; as Mr. *H.* ſuppoſes, when he tells us, *Submiſſion is due to Governors, not for their own ſake, but meerly for the ſake of publick Happineſs.* Where I muſt obſerve, Mr. *H.* has not rightly enumerated the Ends of Submiſſion to Governors. He takes Notice of two only, Themſelves, and the Happineſs of their Subjects. Whereas, if he had pleaſed, he might have mentioned a Third of much weightier Conſideration than either of theſe, that is, their being *God's Ordinance.* But this he well knew was not for his Purpoſe, and therefore he thought it more convenient to drop it quite, than to ſtart a Difficulty that was not to be got over. This one would think were a pretty bold At-

* *P.* 32. † *Ibid.*

tempt

tempt in a Caſe wherein the Apoſtle is ſo expreſs to the contrary. But this is a ſmall Matter with Mr. *H.* for he tells us roundly in the next Words, that the Apoſtle uſes no ſuch Argument for enforcing our Obedience. *"As for St.* Paul, *whom I was to follow, he uſeth no other Argument to prove, either that* Governors *are of* God, *or that* Submiſſion *is due to them in Point of* Conſcience, *but the* Uſefulneſs *of their Office* to humane Societies. Strange! that a Man can thus poſitively contradict the expreſs Words of the Holy Scripture. *The Powers that be,* ſays the Apoſtle,* *are ordained of God; whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation;* and again,† *Ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath,* or fear of Puniſhment from the Magiſtrate, *but alſo for Conſcience ſake,* and out of Obedience to God Almighty who has required it. Can any thing be more plain than this? St. *Paul uſeth no other Argument to prove,* ſays Mr. *H. that* Submiſſion *is due to Governors in point of* Conſcience, *but the* Uſefulneſs *of their Office to* humane Societies. What can be more different from the Apoſtle? If this be *to follow* St. *Paul,* as he profeſſes he was to do, he would do well when he writes again, to let us know what it is to contradict him.

Beſides, it is the Apoſtle's Aſſertion, ‖ that *there are no Powers but of God;* yet Mr. *H.* ſpeaks here of ſuch, as are *purely of humane Inſtitution.*‡ And yet he would be thought to *follow St.* Paul ſtill.

However,* St. *Peter,* 1 Epiſt. 2. 13. *expreſly calls the* King, *and* Governors *under him, by the Name of an* humane Ordinance. Very true! This Apoſtle calls the Magiſtrate ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσιν, *a humane Creature,* or *Creation.* Not, ſays* *Beza,* becauſe it is invented by Men. And hereto very nearly agree the *Aſſembly-Annotators,* whoſe Words I ſhall take the Liberty to tranſcribe, becauſe it is not improbable they may weigh more with ſome Men, than any other Sort of Paraphraſts. Tho' the Generality of Commentators ſpeak likewiſe to the ſame purpoſe. † *By Ordinance,* ſay they,

* *Rom.* 13. 2. † *V.* 5. ‖ *V.* 1. ‡ *P.* 3. * *In loc.* † *Ibid.*

is meant the framing and ordering of Civil Government, called the Ordinance of Man, not becauſe it is invented by, or hath its original from man; (for all Power is from God, Rom. 13. 1. 2. *tho' ſometimes he uſeth Men as Means, to derive Power or Government to ſuch a Perſon or Perſons, that ſo they may be the more willing to yield Obedience;) but becauſe it is proper to Men, or becauſe it is diſcharged by Men.* Here, I confeſs, they put the Adjunct for the Subject, the Office for him in whom it reſides, and ſpeak only of the Inſtitution of Government, whereas the Apoſtle refers plainly to the Governor, whether he be the King or Emperor, or ſome other ſubordinate Magiſtrate; for ſo are his Words, *whether to the King as ſupreme, or unto Governors*, Deputies and Lieutenants, Proconſuls, or Procurators, *&c.* who were *ſent* to bear Rule in diſtant Countries, where the Emperor could not be preſent to do it in his own Perſon. But yet they interpret the Words to ſuch a Senſe, as ſhews apparently whence they concluded all Authority to be derived. And Archbiſhop *Uſher* has obſerved * of *David Paræus*, that *(altho' otherwiſe no very great Friend to the ſupreme Power of Kings) yet he putteth us here in mind, that the Word κτίσις* uſed in the Text, doth lead us to the Conſideration of God the prime Author of Magiſtracy: For the Magiſtrates (*thus the Words run*) are ſaid to be created, that is, ordained by Men, yet *their firſt Creator properly is God alone, unto whom only all Creation doth properly appertain.* But Mr. *H.* it ſeems knew better. He has at length found out that Government may be of *purely humane Inſtitution*; as if Governors derived their Authority only from a Compact and Stipulation with their People. A Doctrine † he will never be able to maintain to the Satisfaction of any who are not willing to take a confident Aſſertion for a convincing Argument. But this only by the Way.

---

* *Power of the Prince*, part 1. Sect. VI. † *See Bp.* Sanderſon's *Preface to* A. B. Uſher's *Power of the Prince*, Sect. XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII.

What

What I am chiefly to obſerve in this place is, that Mr. *H.* makes the *Public Peace and Happineſs of Mankind the* ſole *End of Government.* And he is ſo full of this Perſuaſion, that he *cannot but wonder it ſhould appear ſtrange to any that can read it.* Now I muſt confeſs I can, and have read it, and am not a little ſurprized at his Admiration, in a caſe where he is ſo palpably in the Wrong. That this is a very weighty *End of Government* is readily granted him; but ſuch an acknowledgment is far from an Owning that it is *the ſole End* of it. There may be other Ends no leſs conſiderable, and that may call for the People's Subjection at leaſt as much as this. And I could mention a late much greater Man than Mr. *H.* I mean the truly Learned and Devout Biſhop * *Beveridge*, who ſticks not to affirm, that the Prince is

---

* *The* King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, *the great and glorious Monarch of all the World, having enacted many gracious Laws, is pleaſed to ſet over every Kingdom and Nation, ſuch Perſons as may put them in Execution. So that I cannot but look upon a lawful King as truly a Repreſentative of the moſt high GOD, as a Parliament of the People; and am therefore perſuaded, that whoſoever rebells againſt Him, rebells againſt GOD himſelf; not only in that he rebells againſt the Ordinance of GOD, and ſo againſt the GOD of that Ordinance; but becauſe he rebells againſt him whom GOD hath ſet up as his Vicegerent, to repreſent his Perſon, and execute his Laws, in ſuch a Part of his Dominions.*

Hence it is that theſe two Precepts, Fear *GOD,* and Honour the King, *are ſo often join'd together in Holy Writ; for he that fears GOD's Power, cannot but honour his Authority; and he that honours not the King that Repreſents GOD, cannot be ſaid to fear GOD who is repreſented by Him. And hence likewiſe it is, that GOD hath been as ſtrict and expreſs in enjoining us Obedience to our Governors, as to Himſelf: For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts,* Rom. 13. 1. Let every Soul be ſubject to the Higher Powers. *Why?* Becauſe there is no Power but of *GOD,* and the Powers that be, are ordained of God.

is set up as a *Representative of the most High*, and that Submission is necessarily to be paid him upon this account. There is also another late Eminent Writer, and whom Mr. *H.* is ready enough to quote as of good Authority, when he thinks it may be for his purpose, the Judici-

---

And he has denounced as great a Judgment against such as rebell against the Magistrate He hath ordained, as against those that rebell against Himself; For whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation, v. 2. *So that the Wrath of GOD shall as certainly fall upon those that rise up against the King, as upon those that fight against GOD. And no wonder that the Punishment should be the same, when the Fault is the same: For he that fights against his King, fights against GOD Himself, who hath invested him with that Power and Authority to govern his People, representing His own Glorious Majesty before them.*

Upon this Ground it is that I believe, the Wickedness of a Prince cannot be a sufficient Plea for the Disobedience of his Subjects; for it is not the Holiness, *but the* Authority of God *that he represents, which the most* Wicked, *as well as the most* Holy *Person* may be endowed with. *And therefore when the Gospel first began to spread it self over the Earth, tho' there was no* Christian *King or Supream Magistrate of what Title soever, to cherish and protect it; nay, tho' the civil Powers were then the greatest Enemies to it; yet, even then, were the Disciples of CHRIST enjoined,* to submit themselves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake.

Insomuch that did I live amongst the Turks, *I should look upon it as my Duty to obey the* Grand Seignor, *in all his lawful Edicts, as well as the most Christian and Pious King in the World. For suppose a Prince be never so* wicked, *and never so* negligent *in his Duty of* protecting *me; it doth not follow that I must neglect mine of* obeying *Him. In such a case I have another Duty added to this; and that is, to pray for him, and to intercede with GOD for his Conversion: For thus hath the King of Kings commanded, that* Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made, *as* for all Men, *so more especially* for Kings, and those that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life in all Godliness and Honesty. 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. *So that whensoever I address to the Court of Heaven, I must be sure to remember my Sovereign on Earth, that GOD would be pleased to enable his Servant to reign on Earth, as Himself doth in Heaven, in Righteousness*

and

Judicious and Learned Dr. *Falkner*, who * in like manner assigns this as a principal cause of the Subjection required of Governors, that it may keep up in our Minds, a Sense of our Duty to God himself, under whom, and by whose Authority they Govern, and whose Deputies and Vicegerents they are; so says S. *Chrysostom* too; † *that the Christians may not complain they are vilified and made contemptible, whilst being Heirs of the Kingdom that is above, they are nevertheless subjected by the Apostle to these earthly Governors*, the Apostle, says he, *shews them that in doing this, he does not so much subject them to their temporal Princes, as to the most High God. For it is he that is obeyed by Submission to Governors.*

But I chose rather to put Mr. *H.* in mind that S. *Peter* || requires subjection to them διὰ τὸν Κύριον, *for the Lord's sake*. Which words shew another Reason for our Obedience, and that it is not owing meerly for the sake of *Publick Happiness*. And upon this account I take it

---

and Mercy. But especially in case of any seeming, or real Default, or Defect, tho' I do not think it a Subject's Duty to judge or censure his Sovereign's Actions, I am to be the more earnest in my Prayers and Intercessions for him; but upon no account to fight, or rebell against him. Bishop Beveridge's *Private Thoughts*, &c. concerning Relations, Ref. 1. P. 247, &c.

* *Though the* good *of the* People *be a great End of Government, yet is it not the* sole end *thereof. But as when a Prince appointeth a Chief Officer of a* Corporation, *this is not only for the benefit of the members of that Society; but it is also intended, that they may be more useful to do the* King service, *and that the Commonwealth may receive benefit thereby: So in a* Sovereignty, *there is a claim of* God's Authority *in the World, for his honour; and therefore out of Conscience, and duty to God, there must be a* Subjection *shewed to Rulers as* his Ministers, *besides what the interest of the* community *will require.* Christian Loyalty. B. 2. C. 2. Sect. 4 p. 403, 404.

† Ἵνα δὲ μὴ λέγωσιν οἱ πτωχοὶ, ὅτι ἐξευτελίζεις ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐνυβρίζεις ὑποτασσόμενος τοῖς τὰ ἡμέτερα ἐχθρῶν βασιλέας καὶ τυραννεῖν μέλλοντας ἀρχῶσιν ὑποτάττων, δείκνυσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἀρχῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ πάλιν ὑποτάττει τοῦτο ποιῶν. Ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ὁ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς ὑποτασσόμενος πείθεται. B. Chrysost. in Rom. 13. 2.

|| 1 S. Pet. 2. 13.

to be that their Throne is called * the Throne of the Lord, and they are said to be † *Gods* in Scripture, and the *Children of the most High*, as being such by Office and Deputation, and designed to represent God the Supream Lord and King, and to rule under, as well as for him. And so Resisting them must be as much a Resisting him whose Deputies and Vicegerents they are, as an Affront put upon an Ambassador, is put also upon his Master, whose Character he bears, and upon whose Message he is sent.

And the same truth is taught in like manner by St. *Paul*, in the Words of Mr. *H*'s. Text, howsoever he has made a shift to find out a contrary Sense for them. For here the Apostle enjoins that *every Soul*, *i. e.* every Person, High and Low, Rich and Poor, Honourable and Dishonourable, *be subject to the Higher Powers*; and gives this Reason of his Injunction, because the Powers are the *Ordinance of God*, and so resisting them is resisting God who has ordained them; and must unavoidably be of very dangerous Consequence, in as much as whosoever thus *resist*, *shall receive to themselves Damnation*. Whence it is undeniable, that this Apostle did not resolve all the Obligation of Subjects to submit to their Superiours, into Mr. *H*'s. *sole end of their Institution*; (tho' by how much the more diligent Superiors are in acting agreeably to that end, so much the greater encouragement have their Inferiors for Submission to them, as the Apostle intimates) he does not, I say, resolve all the Obligation of Subjects to their Superiors into his End of their Institution, but places it chiefly upon the Institution it self, the neglect of which is an Affront to Almighty God, by whose Authority they bear Rule.

And another great End of their Institution, or at least a principal Part of that now mentioned, is a Care of God's Worship and Service, and an Endeavour to

---

* 1 *Chron.* 29. 23.

† *Psal.* 82. 6. and S. *John* 10. 34.

dispose

diſpoſe their Subjects for a better State, againſt they ſhall be taken hence. Which though it be a likely means of bringing down God's Bleſſings upon the Places where duly put in Practice, and ſo is a great Promoter of the *Publick Happineſs of Society*, yet 'tis ſo only conſequentially, and the main Aim of it is another ſort of Happineſs than what can be attained to in this World. And this is what all Rulers have ever thought a principal part of their Office, though many times to very ill purpoſe; as *Jeroboam* did in ſetting up his *Calves* * at *Dan* and *Bethel*; and *Nebuchadnezzar* † in commanding the Worſhip of the *Golden Image*. On the other hand *David* ‖ took care of the Worſhip of the true God, appointed * the *Levites* their Courſes, and † their Duty, ‖ ordered their Pſalms, and * ſet himſelf to diſcountenance Vice and Immorality. *Jehu* † deſtroyed the Worſhippers of *Baal*; *Aſa* ‖ deſtroyed the *Sodomites* and the *Idols*; *Jehoſaphat* * *took away the high places and groves out of Iſrael*, and † commanded the Law of his God to be taught in all the Cities of *Judah*; and *Hezekiah* ‖ proclaimed a Paſſover, and * exhorted the People to return to the Lord God of their Fathers and ſerve and Worſhip him, and † *appointed the Courſes of the Prieſts and the Levites, every Man according to his ſervice, the Prieſts and the Levites for burnt-offerings, and for peace-offerings, to Miniſter, and to give thanks, and to praiſe in the gates of the tents of the Lord.* Theſe things have a Higher tendency, than the Welfare and Happineſs of the Publick, as much as Eternal Glory is above all earthly Comforts and Advantages. And yet being a great part of the Magiſtrates Office, I cannot believe, but when Mr. *H.* reflects upon it, he will readily acknowledge, that the *Publick Peace and Happineſs of*

---

* 1 Kings, 12. 28, 29. † Dan. 3. 1, &c. ‖ 1 Chron. 16. 4, &c. * Ch. 23. 6. † V. 28, &c. ‖ See the Titles of them. * Pſal. 101. 3, &c. † 2 Kings 10 28. ‖ 1 Kings 15. 12. * 2 Chron. 17. 6. † V. 7, 8, 9. ‖ 2 Chron. 30. 1, &c. * V. 6, 7, 8. † Ch. 31. 2.

Mankind, which as it is *Publick* and relates to Society, muſt neceſſarily be in this World, is not the *ſole end of Government*.

2. And yet if I ſhould grant Mr. *H.* his Poſition, though there is no reaſon for doing it, if I ſhould grant him, I ſay, that *the Publick Peace and Happineſs of Mankind were the ſole End of Government*, I am not ſenſible that this would be of any Service to his Doctrine of Reſiſtance; for theſe two reaſons, 1. All that could fairly be inferred from hence is no more than that God Almighty muſt therefore have allowed the Subject all that Liberty which is neceſſary for promoting this good Deſign, ſo highly beneficial to Mankind; and therefore when he has forbidden all Reſiſtance, as he has certainly done in the 2d Verſe, if words can do it, he did it to prevent the much greater Miſchiefs that would accrue to Societies from Rebellion, than from Tyranny. I preſume I have as much right to argue upon Inferences as Mr. *H.* And if his whole Diſcourſe be built upon a Wrong Inference, I may be allowed to oppoſe him upon a Right one. He firſt concludes the *Happineſs of Society to be the ſole End of Government*, and that Reſiſtance is in divers Caſes the beſt way of preſerving this Happineſs, and then that the Apoſtle muſt have allowed it. On the other hand I have ſhewn that the All-wiſe God who beſt knows what will anſwer his own End, hath expreſly forbidden all Reſiſtance; which upon Mr. *H*'s. Suppoſition of the *Happineſs of Society being the ſole End of Government*, muſt neceſſarily imply that Reſiſtance is therefore more Deſtructive of this Happineſs than Submiſſion, in as much as otherwiſe it would never have been forbidden at all, and eſpecially not with this terrible commination, of Damnation to thoſe who venture upon it. Wherefore were I in Mr. *H*'s. place, I would much ſooner diſtruſt my own Judgment, and ſuſpect I might poſſibly be miſtaken; and that neither Submiſſion might be ſo detrimental, nor Reſiſtance ſo uſeful to Society as I had imagined, than contrary to the plain Words of my Text, and the univerſal Belief and Practice of the Chriſtian Church

through

through all the first Ages of it, pretend to magnifie Resistance, as the only Means of promoting the main End of Government. I should rather be inclined to think that I might be out in my Notions of Resistance, and that the Consequences of it might be different from what I had hitherto perswaded my self, than that God would make *the Happiness of Society the sole End of Government*, and yet at the same time condemn not only the best in my conception, but the only Method that could effectually answer that End.

God Almighty can bring his own Ends about without our Assistance: And it is but a vain thing to imagine that a Church or Nation must unavoidably be ruined, if they do not follow the dictates of humane Wisdom for their own Preservation, though in direct Opposition to the Words of Scripture. * *There is no restraint to the Lord*, but he can equally *save by many or by few*, can cause † *one to chase a thousand, and two to put ten thousand to flight*, ‖ can defeat the Counsel of the most subtle *Achitophel*, and *turn it into foolishness*, * *nor is there any Wisdom, or Understanding, nor Counsel against him.* And there is no need therefore that a People betake themselves to Arms for their Security against their Sovereign's Encroachments, or whatsoever ill usage of them; it being a much safer course, by patient suffering to commit themselves and all their Concerns into God's hands, and leave the Event with him. And that Almighty God has thought fit to prescribe this method, rather than that of Resistance, is to me a full indication, that such a patient Submission will at the long run prove more advantageous to his Church and People, than any Opposition they can make against their lawful Governours. And by consequence, if we should suppose the People's Happiness and Safety to be the *sole End of Government*, even this Supposition would plead for a quiet Non-resistance as the propereſt means of a

---

* 1 Sam. 14. 6. † Deut. 32. 30. ‖ 2 Sam. 15. 31. * Prov. 21. 30.

Nation's Security, with all that dare rely upon God's good Providence and Protection.

2. The Welfare and Good of the Society is not what Mr. *H.* takes it to be. For he makes it to reſpect the Subjects only, whereas a Society includes the Head as well as the other Members. And the Welfare and Happineſs of the Society, is the Welfare and Happineſs of the Whole, not of one part without the other. The Peace and Welfare of a College does not mean of the Fellows and Scholars only, without the Maſter, who is the Head and Principal Part of it. Nor by a Corporation can we properly underſtand the Aldermen, Common-Council, and Burgeſſes, without their Head the Mayor. So neither does a City-Company exclude the Maſter, nor an Army its General, nor a Family the Parent or Maſter of it. Nor is there any manner of Reaſon, why a King ſhould not be looked upon as a Member, whilſt he is the chief and principal Member, the Head of his Kingdom. And his Intereſt therefore and Welfare ought to be taken into that of the Community, it being impoſſible the whole Kingdom ſhould be Sound and Healthy, whilſt its Head is Sick. And ſo the learned and judicious Biſhop *Sanderſon* determines the *Safety* of the *People*, * to be that of the *whole Community, of the King together with his Subjects*; who can never be truly ſafe and happy, unleſs He be ſo too. And ſo ſays a later Writer of great worth †, *What is that Publick whereof you ſo frequently ſpeak? Is*

---

* *Salutem Populi*, id eſt, totius *Communitatis*, ut ea vox *Regem* unà cum *ſubditis* complectitur, *ſupremam* Legem eſſe, nemo ſanæ mentis negaverit; at *ſalutem populi*, id eſt, *ſubditorum*, excluſo Rege, ſupremam eſſe Legem quis dixerit niſi aut *fatuus*, aut *Impoſtor? Fatuus*, ſi ipſi ſibi ſic dicenti fidem habeat; ſi non habeat, *Impoſtor*. De Obligat. Conſcient. Prælect. 9. Sect. 16.

† The Plea of Publick Good not ſufficient to juſtifie the taking up Arms, againſt our Rightful and Lawful Sovereigns.

it

it not that whereof Kings are the Head? Whence he infers, *the* Good *of the* Publick *muſt be* Their *Good and* Our *Good in conjunction.* A plain and rational Aſſertion, and that one would think needed no proof, nor were to be contradicted by any that does but in the leaſt conſider it. And yet Mr. *H.* has found out a very cunning Anſwer for it, in theſe Words.

1. * *If the Publick be that whereof Kings are the Head, then the Good of the Publick is the Good of that whereof Kings are the Head, that is the Good of the Body, not of the Head, unleſs this Author will make Kings the Head of the Head, as well as of the Body.* This is a notable Diſcovery; and ſuch as I dare ſay, no Man would have hit upon but Mr. *H.* The Body is that whereof the chief Part is the Head, therefore it is the Trunk without the Head. Let Mr. *H.* make any thing better of his Argument than this, if he can; for my part I cannot. And I much doubt, if his Head were once ſevered from the reſt of his Body, that they would both be but in an ill condition. Surely this was deſigned only to ſhew his Wit, and divert his Readers. For he muſt have a very mean opinion of their Underſtanding, if he could imagine ſuch trifling to paſs with them for Argument. Suppoſe I ſhould ſay, *The Good of the Publick is the Good of that whereof* the Populace are the Feet, would it any way follow from hence, that it were the good of the reſt of the Community, but not of the Populace, *unleſs we will make* the Populace the Feet of the Feet, as well as of the *Body?* I am apt to think Mr. *H.* himſelf will not ſay this. And yet it is an Inference exactly parallel to his own. Beſides,

2. He has a ſecond Anſwer not a jot better than the former, namely, that *ſuppoſing that* Kings *are the* Head *of the* Publick *(tho' he ſhould think that* King, Lords, *and* Commons *are more properly the* Head *of the* Pub-

* Pref. to his 2d Edition. *p.* vi.

lick

lick *in which we are concerned;) it is not at all just to argue from the* Metaphorical *use of the Words* Body, *and* Head: *as if because the* Natural Body *cannot subsist without that particular* Head *to which it is once joined; therefore the* Body Politick *cannot possibly be benefitted without unviolated regard to one particular Person who hath once been the Head of it. No one can deny but that* Usurpers *may be the* Heads *of the* Body Politick; *as the* Cæsars *were at first: Yet I dare say, this* Author *will allow that the* Body *may seek their* own Good *as distinct from that of* Usurpers. *A* General *of an* Army *is the* Head *of that* Body; *yet may that* Head *be in many* Cases *changed to the great Advantage of that* Body, *&c.* And a little after, *That the* Good *of the* Publick (*called the* Body *Politick only in a* Figurative *Sense*) *is not so tied to one particular* Head, *is evident from the* Death *of some, and the Succession of other* Heads *to the same* Rule *over the same* Body Politick. Here is such a series of Argumentation as I should not have expected from one of Mr. *H's.* Character and Ingenuity; and which I can impute to nothing but the badness of his Cause that would not admit of better.

First, He cannot think Kings to be the Head of the Body Politick. Though if he look into the Statute-Book, he will find it plainly taught; if into Mr. *Sheringham's Remonstrance of the King's Right*, and Dr. *Hickes's Jovian*, he will see it proved: if into all the Addresses made to the Queen, by Either or Both of the Houses of Parliament, he cannot fail of observing that they constantly stile themselves *Her Majesty's most Dutiful and Loyal Subjects*; if into the Oath of Supremacy always taken from the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign till the Revolution, that will teach him that the King, or Queen was all that time acknowledged to be *the only Supreme Governour of this Realm.* And if this be not the Head of the Community, Mr. *H.* may please at his leisure, (not to *think*, but to prove) that all assertions of this nature, whether in the Statute-Book, or wheresoever else, are meer impositions and signifie nothing at all. He may also consider farther,

what

what a delicate half-headed Body this Nation muſt be, whenever there is no Parliament ſitting, and eſpecially when none in Being.

Secondly, Mr. *H.* will not allow it *juſt to argue from the* Metaphorical *uſe of the Words* Body *and* Head. But if he will not, he ought to make us a new Rhetorick, and teach us a new way of ſpeaking, different from that of our Forefathers, who have always made uſe of Metaphors, as of great benefit for illuſtrating the truth, when not miſapplied, nor purſued too far. *Ariſtotle* * affirms them to be highly uſeful both in Poetry and Proſe. And ſo ſays *Voſſius*, † *Nullus eſt florentior tropus, &c. There is no Trope more beautiful, and which adds more light to what is ſpoken, than a Metaphor.* And Mr. *H.* can ſhew no cauſe, why it may not be as reaſonably uſed, and as pertinently, in the preſent caſe as in any other. I am confident he will find none wherein it is more common, even amongſt the beſt Writers.

And yet if we comply ſo far with him, as to lay aſide this manner of expreſſion, I can foreſee no advantage he will get by it. For he will find it no leſs difficult a Task to prove the King to be no Part of the Society or Community, nor any way intereſted in its Welfare and Happineſs, than to prove that the Happineſs of the whole Body does not imply that of the Head, as much at leaſt, as of any of the other Members; in truth a great deal more.

Thirdly, Mr. *H.* thinks it ſtrange, that *becauſe the* Natural Body *cannot ſubſiſt without that particular* Head *to which it was once joined*, it ſhould hence be thought that *the* Body Politick *cannot* poſſibly *be benefited without unviolated regard to one particular Perſon, who has*

---

* Καὶ ὅπ τῶτο πλεῖςον δύναῖαι, καὶ ἐν ποιήσει καὶ ἐν λόγοις, αἱ μεταφοραὶ, εἴρηται, καθάπερ ἐλέχθη ἐν τοῖς περὶ ποιητικῆς. De Rhetor. l. 3. c. 2. p. 181. τὸ μὲν ἔν μὴ ἰδιωτικὸν ποιήσει, μηδὲ ταπεινὸν ἡ γλῶτα, καὶ ἡ μεταφορὰ, &c. De Poeticâ, c. 22.

† De Rhetor. l. 4. c. 4.

once

once been the Head of it. And he may think so as long as he pleases, without any Body to contradict him that I know of. These Words *who has once been the Head of it*, argue themselves not to relate to any one who is so; and then Mr. *H.* would do well to tell us, who ever stood up for an unviolated Regard to one who was not at that time the Head of the Community. When the Emperour ~~Henry~~ *Charles* Vth. resigned his Dominions, did any ever think they were still bound to pay their Allegiance to Him, and not rather to his Brother and Successor *Ferdinand* the First? Nor do the *Dutch* think themselves any longer obliged to those of their States-General, when once the time for which they were chosen is expired, unless they be chosen again. So that it is not a Person's having been once Head of a People that requires *an unviolated regard* to Him. And if this were all Mr. *H.* argues against, I presume none would oppose him in it: I am sure I would not. But this is not his Case; the Design of both his Sermon and it's Vindication was to encourage the Resistance of whatsoever present Sovereign, that does not act up to the Ends of his Station. And instead of pursuing his Point, to talk of one who has been, and is not the Head to whom this Regard is due, is only to amuse his Readers with something he knows to be not at all to the purpose.

Fourthly, Mr. *H.* lays it down as an unquestionable Truth, that Usurpation entitles to the Headship of the Community: * *No Man can deny*, says he, *but* Usurpers *may be the* Heads *of the* Body Politick. Which would sound odly from any one who in the least pretends to understand the nature of our Constitution; but it does so more especially from Mr. *H.* who but a few Lines before would not allow a lawful King alone to be the Head, when the Laws plainly teach he is. Yet as shy as Mr. *H.* is in relation to the Headship of a Rightful Sovereign, he suffers *no Man* to doubt whe-

* *Pref.* P. vii.

ther

ther an Usurper has a Right to it. So that according to him, the two *Cromwell*'s were better Heads of our *Body Politick* than any that have reigned since. And if he be of this Opinion, no wonder that he shews himself so Zealous for the Doctrine of Resistance of lawful Princes. Though whether of Usurpers I cannot say; for though he is well assured, † the Author he writes against *will allow that the* Body *may seek their own* Good, *as distinct from that of Usurpers*, he does not vouchsafe to acquaint us with his own Sentiments in the case, and whether he admits of resisting such or not.

Fifthly, What follows next, is as trifling as any thing he has said in all this loose and indigested Period. *A General of an Army is the* Head *of that* Body, *yet may that* Head *be in many Cases changed to the great advantage of that* Body. The Question under debate was whether the King, or Queen, be the Head of the Kingdom, and their Good included in that of the whole. And the Answer is, *a General of an Army may be changed, and sometimes to great Advantage.* Mr. *H.* may call this arguing, if he pleases. His other instance of a *Master of a Family* is as impertinent, but not so practicable as this; in as much as a Sovereign has just Power to change the General of his Forces, but the Servants of a Family have not a Right to turn out their Master.

Sixthly, He has one Consideration more under this Head, but still of the same strain with the others. *The Interest of the Body Politick, says Mr.* H. *is not tied to one particular Head*; and this he tells us *is evident from the* Death *of* some, *and the Succession of other* Heads *to the same* Rule *over the same Body Politick.* Does Mr. *H.* take this to prove that the Good of the Prince is not to be taken in conjunction with that of the Subjects, to make up the Good of the Publick? If he does not, he knows it is nothing to the purpose; and if he does, I must confess he has a peculiar way of thinking.

† *Ibid.*

For

For may not the Good of the Prince be always a part of the Publick Good, and a principal part of it too, unless the Prince were immortal? It is true, when a Prince dies, his Good is no farther included in that of his People; but then the Heir's is, who hereupon commences immediately the Prince, and is to all intents and purposes the Head of the Community as much as his Predecessor was. And so from Generation to Generation. It being a constant Maxim in Law, that *the King never dies*, the Nation can never be without a Head, so long as there is any remaining to Inherit the Throne. And though it be not the same King, or Queen, yet so long as there is a Rightful King or Queen in being, there is as much a Head whose Interest is to be considered in relation to the Good of the Kingdom, as if it were still the same individual Person.

Besides, I would desire Mr. *H.* to reflect, whether this way of arguing would not make much more against, than for him; and whether it would not much rather prove that the Good of the People ought not to be attended to, than that of the Sovereign. Because the People are in a more continual flux than the Prince. The Prince dies now, and then, as other particular Persons do. But the People are every Hour coming into and going out of the World, and never continue the same for any time. So that if the Change of Persons exclude from an interest in that of the Publick, it must do it chiefly where the greatest Change is, that is, amongst the Subjects, vast Multitudes of whom Die, in the Reign of one single Prince.

Thus I have fully considered Mr. *H*'s. second Answer to that Question, Whether the *Publick* be not that whereof *Kings* are the Head? I now leave it, and proceed to the truest Assertion I have met with in him for a great while; which is that

3. *The true Interest of Kings can never be separated from the true Interest of the Publick of which they are the Head.* Very right! and agreeable enough to the Sentiments of the Author Mr. *H.* is endeavouring to confute! But how then does Mr. *H.* bring himself

off

off here? He gives this reaſon of his Aſſertion: *As long as they are at the Head*, it is their *chief and great Intereſt to promote the Publick Good*. An Aſſertion no leſs true than the former! But then on the other hand, it is no leſs the Subjects Intereſt to promote the Publick Good, that is, of both their Sovereign and themſelves, than it is the Prince's. Well, but ſuppoſe the Prince inſtead of promoting the Publick Intereſt ſets himſelf to ruine it. And ſuppoſe on the contrary that he is falſly charged with doing this when he does it not; how terrible may be the conſequences of ſuch a Suggeſtion, though ever ſo groundleſs? Suppoſe again that the Charge be juſt, and that the King do really ſeek the damage and hurt of his People; in this caſe he does very ill. But this is no reaſon why they ſhould behave themſelves undutifully and unjuſtly towards him, or ſhould bring a far greater miſchief upon themſelves by riſing up againſt him, than they were like to have ſuffered from his Male-adminiſtration. Yet this is a common effect of Rebellion; which is always pretended to be, as * *Abſalom* inſinuated of his, for the Publick Benefit; but uſually proves a Remedy incomparably worſe than the Diſeaſe, an Evil much more dreadful, than what was to have been prevented or removed by it. Here Mr. *H.* reſumes his former contrivance of making the Publick a headleſs Body, becauſe Kings are the Heads of it; in as much as being ſo, (in ſome ſort, though he *thinks not properly*) the Publick with him is only the Body without the Head, the Subjects only without the Sovereign. He diſputes alſo againſt aſſiſting the King *in ſeeking an imaginary good of his own*, and that tends *to the Ruine* of his Subjects. Which might as well have been forborn; and no doubt would, if he had bethought himſelf that the Author he writes againſt, never ſpeaks of any ſuch miſtaken or *imaginary Good*, but the real Benefit and Safety of the Prince. And this real Good therefore Mr. *H.* ought to have

---

* 2 *Sam.* 15. 3, 4, 5, 6.

ſhewn

ſhewn not to be the concern of the Publick; and not to have run off to a falſe *imaginary* Good, which this Controverſie has nothing to do with. He asks likewiſe, *If the Good (that is, the Temporal Grandeur) of the* Head *muſt never be diſregarded, why muſt the* Publick Good, *the* Good *of the* Body *be trampled upon?* In which Queſtion, he firſt makes the *Publick Good*, to be the Good of the Body without the Head; which I have before obſerved, is a meer quibble, and has not ſo much as the face of an Argument. And ſecondly he ſuppoſes the Gentleman he writes againſt to be for trampling upon the Good of the Body; though he cannot find one word in him to that purpoſe, but on the contrary he was for endeavouring the *Good* of the *Publick*, that is, both of the Head and the reſt of the Body, by all honeſt and lawful means; only he would not have any uſed but what are ſo. All Mr. *H.* can charge upon him is, that he was rather for ſubmitting to God's Will, and depending upon his Providence, and obſerving his Commands, than for ſeeking after the *Temporal Grandeur* of himſelf or his Fellow-Subjects by any kind of Sin. And if Mr. *H.* will call this *trampling upon the Good of the Publick*, there is no help for it. But then let him ſpeak out, let him openly declare whether he thinks the Subjects can in any caſe defend themſelves better without God, than he can do it without them; and again, whether that Preſervation is worth the having, which is not to be had without departing from their Duty both to God and their Sovereign.

4. Mr. *H.* declares concerning *Publick Good*, that either it *is in every Caſe the ſame with what this Author calls the Good of the King, or it is not. If it be, then*, ſays he, *my Doctrine is as much againſt* Reſiſtance in any Caſe, *as His can be. If it be not, then may it be conſider'd and regarded as ſomething, in ſome Caſes, diſtinct from it.* I ſuppoſe Mr *H.* has a meaning in what he ſays here, tho' I am not yet ſo happy as to comprehend it. The Words he undertakes to deſcant upon, are, that *the Good of the Publick muſt be their* [the Sovereigns] *Good, and our Good in Con-*

junction

junction. And this Mr *H.* takes upon him to disprove; but whether what is here recited be any disproof of it, I must leave to the impartial Reader to judge, who perhaps may understand the force of it, better than I do.

5. Mr. *H.* argues from the Subjects Right, to sue in Civil Courts for the Maintenance or Recovery of their own just Rights, tho' it be against the King. *This*, says he, *is not seeking their own Good in conjunction with the King's.* Where I must beg his Pardon, if I cannot concur in Opinion with him: For it is only seeking our own Good in such a way, as the Laws both of God and the Land allow of; such a way as not only does not tend to expel and dethrone the King, but does not aim at divesting him of any the least Right that belongs to him, and can justly be claim'd by him. And this I take to be *seeking our own Good in conjunction with our Sovereign's.* And I challenge Mr. *H.* to disprove it, if he can, by shewing that to stick to the Rules and Laws of the Constitution, and pay the Sovereign such Allegiance as these prescribe, is not for the Good of the Head. It tends very much to the Good of the Head, to have all its Laws duly observ'd, and to live quietly in the Possession of all its own Rights, tho' the Subjects do not surrender up theirs, but claim and insist upon them, so long as they can be allow'd to do it in a Legal way. Nor is this Method of Proceeding any way inconsistent with a Promise, * *To bear Faith and true Allegiance to the Queen's Highness, Her Heirs and Lawful Successors, and to assist and defend all Jurisdictions, Privileges, Prehe-minencies and Authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, Her Heirs and Successors, or annext to the imperial Crown of this Realm.* To which Mr. *H*'s Doctrine of Resistance is directly opposite.

---

* *As Queen* Elizabeth *required the Subjects to Swear, in the Oath of Supremacy impos'd*, Eliz. 1. *ch.* 1. 19. *and An.* 5. *ch.* 1. 5. *and* 16, *and as was constantly Sworn till the Revolution.*

6. *If he mean*, says Mr. *H. by the Good of the King*, his being *unresisted, and continuing in the possession of his Headship, his Business should have been to prove, that this would be more, in all Cases, for the Publick Good, than Resistance.* But how will Mr *H.* prove, that this was to have been his Business, when it certainly was not? It is enough for his purpose, that it ordinarily is so. And if it rarely, very rarely prove otherwise; if one Rebellion in a hundred escape the dire effects of the other Ninety and Nine, who but Mr *H.* would not think this abundantly sufficient Evidence, of the great Mischief of Resistance, to the Subject as well as to the Prince, tho' the Event should not be the same *in all Cases*, not one excepted?

And thus it appears, after all Mr *H.* has said to the contrary, that the Good of the Society, implies in it the Good of the Head as well as of the Inferiour Members, and that to afflict and hurt the Head, tho' in order to any advantage the other Parts may hope for by it, can never tend to the Welfare of the whole, and indeed very seldom, if ever, to the benefit of any considerable part of it. Some bold daring Spirits may possibly gain by disturbing the ordinary course of Affairs, and may build their Fortunes for a time upon the ruin of others. But besides, that this is ordinarily but for a time, *their Wickedness* very frequently *falling upon their own Head*, or that of their immediate Posterity; besides this, I say, great Multitudes are undone to raise them, and so the Community in general suffers to a great degree, in the other Parts, as well as the Head, the Prince, whose Sufferings alone (especially if hereto be added, those of the whole Royal Family who usually are great Sufferers with him) testify that Body whereof he is the Head to be but in a bad condition, whilst he, the Head, is so.

And I conclude therefore with this excellent Author, † that *if the keeping of Allegiance should seem to any one, at some time not to serve the greater degree of Publick Good*,

† *Plea of Publick Good*, p. 6.

so

ſo well as the caſting it off would; that rare and accidental Diſſervice muſt be overborn by the Goodneſs of the general Rule, and is abundantly compenſated by the general and ordinary Convenience.

The ſum of what is hitherto ſaid in this Chapter is, that the Safety and Happineſs of the Society is not the only End of Government, but Almighty God has other wiſe and good purpoſes to ſerve by it, particularly to keep up in Men's Minds a Senſe of his Dominion, and the relation we all ſtand in to him, and that all Impiety may be diſcountenanc'd and puniſh'd, and his Worſhip encourag'd and taken care of; and yet if it had been ſo, this would not do Mr *H*'s Buſineſs, as not being ſufficient to maintain his Doctrine of Reſiſtance; both becauſe all Reſiſtance is forbidden in Scripture, and becauſe the Good of the Head is included in that of the Publick, at leaſt as much as of any other part of the Body.

Mr. *H.* adds, that *The appointing them to Govern is nothing elſe, but an appointing that Submiſſion ſhould be paid to them.* Then I hope it is not an appointing that they ſhould be reſiſted, whenſoever they fail of governing as they ought, whenſoever they *deflect from the Will of God*, and do not apply themſelves as they might to promote the *Publick Good.* This I take to be a neceſſary Conſequence, and which Mr *H.* will not readily get over. But now to the Propoſition; *the Appointing them to Govern is nothing elſe, but an Appointing Submiſſion to be paid to them.* Another would have been apt to think, that *Appointing* Rulers to *Govern*, had been not only to give them Authority over others, but to lay a charge upon them likewiſe in order to a due Execution of the Office hereby given them; and that the Subjects Obedience to them was the matter of another Command, ſuch as this given by St. *Paul* to all Subjects, of obeying, and not reſiſting thoſe who are thus put in Authority. And it is a certain Truth, that *Appointing* any to *Govern* is laying a Duty upon them, which they are thenceforward obliged to attend to, as they will anſwer the neglect of it to Almighty God; but is no more an *Ap-*

pointing that Submission shall be paid them by their People, than requiring the People to obey them, is a Commissioning them to Govern. Which I presume no one will pretend it to be, they being two very distinct Acts. And indeed, according to this new Doctrine, *David, the Man after God's own Heart*, could not be a good Ruler, when his People revolted from him, because *Submission* was not then *paid him*. Nor on the contrary, could either *Jeroboam* or *Ahab* be bad Governors, whilst the People concurred with the one, in the Worship of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, and with the other in the Service of *Baal*, it being certain, that Submission was then paid to them in each of these Cases. This is something that *may be urged*, and very justly too, against what Mr *H.* here asserts. And it is very far from being *horrible Blasphemy*, or from *making it*, as he pretends, part of God's *positive Commission to Rulers, to transgress their own Duty, and to ruin the People committed to their Charge.*

Whether teaching Subjects to resist their Governors, whensoever they shall think it requisite, be *speaking evil of Dignities*, or *vilifying the Lord's Anointed*, may in a good Measure be collected from what hath hitherto been offer'd, but will be yet more evident before I come to the end of this Discourse, and therefore I shall say nothing of it here.

Thus I have given some account of Mr *H*'s Five foregoing Propositions; and I hope I have made it appear, that there is nothing of Solidity or good Argument in any of them; and that his only Business has been to father his own groundless Notions upon the Apostle, in open defiance to both the Words and meaning of his Text.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Whether Mr. H. has been so prudent and cautious in Preaching this Doctrine, as he professes himself to have been?

NOW I must attend Mr. *H.* a while in relation to what he pleads, in Vindication of his own Prudence and Caution, in teaching Subjects *the Lawfulness of Resisting in some Cases.* This, says Mr. *H. is not delivered with that great imprudence and extreme want of Caution, which some would make the World believe.* And he may value himself as much as he pleases upon it. But if one should undertake to preach up the Lawfulness of Idolatry, Gluttony, Drunkenness, Pride, Uncleaness, Robbery, or the like, I doubt it would be thought but a poor Plea for him here, and will stand him in very little stead at the last Day, that he did it with Caution and Prudence. And I am yet to learn, where the difference lies as to Preaching up Rebellion, or in Mr. *H's* own Words, *the Lawfulness of Resisting in some Cases.* The only Caution and Prudence that I know allowable, in relation to any sort of Sin, is not to Preach it up at all; and next to this, to repent of and retract the Preaching of it. And I heartily wish Mr. *H.* had been so cautious and prudent, as to have taken either of these courses. But let us see what he has to say for himself.

1. *If he has been as cautious and prudent in laying down the true Doctrine of* Non-resistance *as the* Apostle *himself hath been, he might hope, one would think, to escape free from all severe Censures.* No doubt but he might. And they would be very unreasonable Men, and very indifferent Christians, that would bear hard [redacted] upon him in this case. Yet that he has stuck thus close to the Apostle, *he did not doubt would have been very evident to*

all who heard, or read his Sermon. It seems he has a very good opinion of this Sermon himself, and expects that all his Readers should have it too. But I can assure him a great number of them have had a very different notion of it, and earnestly wished for his own sake, as well as for the sake of his mistaken Admirers, that he had been so cautious and prudent as never to have preached it. And with very good Reason. For does St. *Paul* *, *whom he was to follow*, make the least mention of Resistance, as lawful in any Case? Does he plead for it in any respect? Does he ever affirm that wicked and destructive Governors may, and ought to be opposed? This, it is true, is Mr. *H's.* Doctrine; and it agrees as well with S. *Paul's*, as Heat and Cold, or Light and Darkness agree with each other. For the Apostle requires Subjection to the *Higher Powers* in general, and declares them, without distinction, to be the *Ordinance of God*, and as such to be irresistible, upon pain of *Damnation*. And had he really designed to condemn all manner of Resistance of our Governors, in whatsoever case, what could he have been expected to say more, than he has already said? Could he have laid a surer Foundation for their Authority, or that might strike a greater awe of them into their Subjects, than by assuring us that they are *God's Ordinance*? Could he have put a more effectual bar in the way of Resistance, and forcible Opposition to them, than by condemning all attempts of this nature, as a *Resisting the Ordinance of God?* Or could he have ratified his Prohibition with a severer Sanction, than what we meet with in the following Words, that *they who resist shall receive to themselves Damnation?* If this be not a sufficient provision against Resistance, what one Sin is there that may not be freely ventured upon, and that Mr. *H.* may not recommend to his Auditory, with the same grace, the same prudence and caution, that he does this? There is none in either the Old or New Testa-

* Page 32.

ment;

ment, whose Prohibition is enforced with a more dreadful Commination, or which deserves to be more seriously attended to, and provided against, than this of Eternal *DAMNATION*; Which Mr. *H.* owns † to be here intended by the Apostle. Or if he had not, it were easily proved that this || must be the import of the Word in this place; from the Obligation that lies upon all in point of Conscience to be in Subjection to their Governors, *v.* 5. and the Sin of acting contrary to it; from the great Guilt of *resisting* a known *Ordinance of God*, v. 2. and because otherwise here were no Penalty at all threatened to a successful Rebel, who is not punished, but abundantly rewarded for his wickedness, in this World; and so has nothing to debar him from continuing in it, unless he be in danger of *Damnation* in the other. To which Considerations I also add in the last place, that though the Word Κρίμα, in its Original and Primary Signification means only *Judgment*, yet seeing not only *Hesychius* renders it ἀνταπόδοσις Θεῦ, but in the Language of the New Testament, particularly in these following Texts, *S. Mat.* 23. 14. *S. Luke* 20. 47. 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. and 5. 12. *S. Jam.* 3. 1. *S. Jud.* 4. it is used for κατάκριμα, and so imports no less than Eternal *Damnation*, there can be no reason given why it should not do so here.

---

† Page 35.

|| This Word must also include *the Judgment of God*, and his condemnation. For since this Resistance is a *Sin*, and against the *Ordinance of God*, v. 2. that Person who puts himself upon breaking his Commands, and opposing his Authority, must thereby render himself *guilty* before *God*; or in S. *Chrysostom*'s Expression concerning this Text, he doth Θεὸν παροξύνειν, *provoke God*, and must expect from him δίκλω σφόδρα μείζω, *heavy judgment*. *Dr Falkner*'s Christian Loyalty, *l.* 2. *c.* 4. *p.* 485. And yet these words of S. *Chrysostom* are of a much higher importance, signifying no less than *the most excessively intolerable Punishment*.

All Mr. *H.* has to say in justification of his Doctrine is, that * *The Apostle proves Governors to be the Ordinance of God, only from the excellent usefulness of their Office to humane Society, and founds the necessity of submission, and paying Tribute, upon the useful and good End of their Office only.* But what if Mr. *H.* have mistaken the Apostle, and this be not the only Consideration whereupon S. *Paul* presses the Duty of Submission? Then the necessary consequence must be, that Submission may still be due to ill Governors, notwithstanding any thing Mr. *H.* has said to the contrary.

Now that the Usefulness of Government is not the only proof of their being the *Ordinance of God*, I thought I had already made very evident, in treating of the Fifth Proposition. But because Mr. *H.* † brings it over again, I shall here allow it a farther Consideration. And whosoever but attends to the two first Verses of the Chapter, will easily see, that the Apostle founds our Obligation to subjection upon another bottom, namely the relation Governors stand in to Almighty God, as I have before observed. Which he speaks of all Governors; and must be owned to do so, unless Mr. *H.* can find out a *medium* to prove, that when the Apostle says, *there are no Powers but of God*, he can be understood to intend, either that there can be no bad Governors, or that such are no Governors at all, and so not included in that general Assertion. The Apostle there declares Governors to be the *Ordinance of God*, not from *the usefulness of their Office*, but from their Divine Appointment, and as they are from Him; they are *ordained of God*, and this the Apostle makes the foundation, as well he might, of their being his Ordinance. This is a natural, and a necessary inference; but that they are *God's Ordinance*, only because their Office is beneficial to Mankind, is a consequence that is neither necessary, nor natural.

---

* Page 34.
† Ibid.

I grant, the Apostle having thus established our obligation to Subjection, proceeds to enforce the practice of it, from the singular Advantage that is intended to Mankind by Government, and the great Benefit we usually reap by it. Yet he never tells us that this is the only Foundation of our Obedience, and when Princes deflect from the constant pursuit of this, they cease to be God's Ordinance, or to have any Obedience due to them. Nor is it to be imagined that he should. For a Prince's acting unagreeably to the End of his Government, does not prove him to be no Governor, but only that he is a bad one; and so he is really a Governor, though not so good as he ought to be. And if he be in any sense a supream lawful Governor (for such only are of God, and such only he owns to be the *Higher Powers*, as I have shewn at large in the first Chapter,) if he be, I say, in any sense a supream lawful Governor, he is one of the *Powers ordained of God*, and not to be resisted.

And what if he act contrary to the End of his Institution? He is then, as I said, an ill Governor; he sins against Almighty God who is his Lord and Sovereign, and must accordingly be sure to be strictly accountable to him for his Misgovernment. But how does this make him no Governour, and prove that *resistance to him*, is not *resistance to the Ordinance of God*?

A Man was made to serve and obey God his Creator and Sovereign Lord. Wherefore if he take a contrary course, and instead of living up to the Ends of his Creation, indulge himself in all sorts of Wickedness, bidding defiance to the Almighty, and daily breaking his known Laws, this makes him a bad Man; but I take it for granted, Mr. *H.* will allow him to be a Man still, though a corrupt, a wicked, a vicious and very sinful Man.

A Steward is designed by his Lord to manage his Estate, and govern his inferiour Servants, as may seem most to his advantage: Yet if this Steward act quite contrary, and waste his Master's Goods, be negligent in his Office, and abuse and *smite his fellow-Servants, and*

eat

eat and drink with the Drunken, this ſhews him a very bad Steward, but does not diveſt him of his Office, till his Lord, in whoſe only Power it is, thinks fit to lay him aſide. So our Bleſſed Lord determines it in his Parable; * *The Lord of that Servant ſhall come in a day, when he looketh not for him*, &c. clearly implying that he is ſtill a Servant, though very ill deſerving to be ſo.

But to argue from S. *Paul* himſelf. I know no better way to explain his meaning, than by enquiring whether Mr. *H*'s. manner of interpretation will hold in other parallel expreſſions of the ſame Apoſtle, who muſt beſt have underſtood his own meaning. For if it do not, it is to be preſumed, Mr. *H.* will ſuſpect that he may have happened to miſtake in this before us. *Epheſ.* 6. 4. The Apoſtle gives this Inſtruction, *Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* And on the other hand, *Coloſ.* 3. 20. *Children are required to obey their Parents in all things*; and this conſideration is added as the foundation of ſuch their Obedience, *for this is well pleaſing unto the Lord.* Which words ſufficiently diſcover the End of a Parent's Authority over his Children to be, that he may require of them ſuch things as are *well pleaſing to the Lord*; for it is only in this caſe they are to be obeyed. But it does not follow from hence, that if Parents do *provoke their children to wrath*, contrary to the Apoſtle's Prohibition, and the deſign of their Paternal Authority; if they grow unreaſonable and tyrannical, and often times require things in no wiſe pleaſing to God; it does not follow, I ſay, from hence, that their Children may caſt off all Duty and Reverence for them, and look upon them as no longer the Parents, to whom Obedience is required, and ſo diſregard them, and not hearken to even their juſt and lawful Commands; and yet leſs that they may turn them out of doors, and ſeize upon their Eſtate, and

* S. Mat. 24. 50.

divide

divide it amongſt themſelves. As Mr. *H.* ſuppoſes may be done to a Prince, when he teaches Subjects, not only to withdraw their active Obedience in ſome caſes, but to reſiſt and expell him, as if he were not God's Ordinance.

The caſe is the ſame likewiſe in relation to our Spiritual Governors, to whom S. *Paul* enjoins all Reverence and Obedience, and particularly upon the account of their great care and labour for the welfare of our Souls. Heb. 13. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves; for they watch for your Souls, as they that muſt give an account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief.* Does Mr. *H.* think Obedience is not due to theſe, as well by means of their being God's Miniſters and Ambaſſadors, as upon account of their faithful diſcharge of their Office? Suppoſe any one of theſe to be idle, and negligent, and not *watch* duly *for the* People's *Souls, as one that muſt give an account* of his Stewardſhip amongſt them; this ſhews him not to anſwer the End of his Inſtitution, and that he is not ſuch a faithful Miniſter of God as he ought to be, and does not come up to what is here given as a reaſon, why they ought to obey him, and the only reaſon for it mentioned in this place. Which is more than can be ſaid in reſpect to *Rom.* 13th, where the uſefulneſs of Government is not the only, nor in truth the Principal reaſon for ſubmitting to the *Higher Powers.* Yet whilſt this negligent uſeleſs Miniſter has his Commiſſion to act as God's Miniſter, he is accountable only to God Almighty, and his Eccleſiaſtical Superiours; and his People muſt expect to anſwer it at their peril, if they refuſe to accept of his Miniſtry, till they can get him either reformed, or regularly removed. Nor can they tumultuouſly riſe up againſt him, and forcibly expell him, without offering violence to the Laws both of God and his Church, and contracting to themſelves the guilt of uſurping a Power, which in no wiſe belongs to them.

Thus

Thus according to S. *Paul*'s way of arguing in other cases, it is evident Mr. *H.* has not shewn such admirable caution or prudence in interpreting these words of the Apostle.

And if we attend only to the Words themselves, they are full against him: For the Apostle here gives two distinct Reasons, against Resisting the Higher Powers; the first and principal, that they have a Divine Commission, and it is therefore both highly undutiful, and extreamly dangerous to rise up against them; the other, that they are appointed for the good of Mankind, and resisting them is therefore a publick Mischief. Or the words may be branched out * into more Particulars, all worthy of serious consideration, and naturally tending to press the Duty upon us, and recommend it the more effectually to our Practice. But

---

* This Duty to Sovereign, and other subordinate Authority derived from that, the Apostle argues from several very excellent Topicks, and undeniably proves from them all, what Obligation Subjects have to obey and honour their Governours. 1. This he proves from the Divine Original of Government, because *the Powers that be are ordained of God.* 2. From the eternal Punishment, without hearty Repentance, of those who disobey; *they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation.* 3. From their temporal Punishment, and the usual Fate of Traitors and Mutineers, *he beareth not the Sword in vain.* 4. He urges this Duty further, from the usefulness of the Governour to secure us in our Just Rights against all Oppressors; because *he is the Minister to us for good, and an Avenger to execute Wrath upon him that doth evil.* And lastly to conclude all, he exhorts Christians not only to ground their Duty upon the *Wrath*, or Vindictive Power of the Magistrate, or upon any other Secular Motive; but to fix it chiefly upon the foot of Religion and Conscience, as the Command of Almighty God, as the Doctrine of our Blessed Lord, and a Rule of the wisest and most peaceable Institution that ever was in the World, *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake.* Dr. *Nichols*'s Duty of Inferiours to Superiours. *Disc.* I. P. 2, 3.

Mr.

Mr. *H.* perhaps may be the first that has taken upon him to reduce them only to one Argument, and drop that which is incomparably the most weighty of all, the Terrors of everlasting Destruction threatened to Resistance. And it is hard to suppose that none should have understood them aright, till he came to make the first discovery of their true meaning. Especially when we reflect how clearly and intelligibly the Apostle has expressed himself; in so much that *he who runneth may* not only *read* the Words, but may at first penetrate into the true and genuine design and importance of them.

The sum is, that Mr. *H's.* Exposition of S. *Paul's* Precept concerning Obedience to the *higher Powers*, is not only unreasonable in it self, but is moreover a great force put upon the Words, and concludes from them what the Apostle cannot by any fair construction be conceived to have meant by them; Besides that it is confuted by other like Expressions of the same Apostle, where this method of interpreting is by no means allowable; And by consequence, that Mr. *H.* has not been so cautious and prudent as he professes himself to have been, not having *followed* the Apostle's Doctrine, as he owns he ought to do, but having invented another of his own in direct Opposition to it.

More than this needs not be said as to the forced account Mr. *H.* gives of the Apostle's Words. And less could not be said, considering how positive he is in asserting his own Gloss, as the only proper sense of the Apostle, and what he was therefore obliged to stick to when he had undertaken to explain S. *Paul's* Doctrine in this point. And since it hence appears that *the Apostle's Expressions and Reasoning* both *can* and ought *to be extended farther than he has extended them*, namely so far as † to require a Passive Submission to bad Governors, as well as an Active to good, I hope he will

† Οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἶπε, πειθέσθω, ἀλλ' ὑποπιπτέσθω. B. Chrysost. in loc.

remember

remember his Promise *of making all the Reparation possible for the injury he has done to this great Apostle.*

And as to his unkind and disingenuous insinuation in what follows, I dare take upon me to assure him, that those who most dislike his manner of proceeding hitherto, are not dissatisfied with him, *because he has given a Description of the Office of Princes, and given an account of their Duty, at the same time that he has given an account of the Duty of their Subjects.* He may Preach upon this Head as long as he pleases, and need not fear they will ever be offended at him for it; provided he keep within due bounds, and impose no new Duty upon Princes, and which the Scripture has not imposed; all their exception to him being only that he has not given so much as a tolerable account of the Duty of Subjects, or that can in any measure be reconciled to S. *Paul*'s Doctrine, or that suits with that Submission which is required of them in other places of Scripture.

2. This is so plain and obvious, that Mr. *H.* himself in the next Paragraph owns a remarkable Difference between the Apostle's Words and his Explication of them. * *I confess*, says he, *there is this difference between this Passage of S.* Paul, *and the foregoing* Sermon, *that there is no Case put by S.* Paul *in express Words, in which* Opposition *to* Governors *is allowed.* Which methinks is a good testimony against himself; and ought to caution his Readers, that they beware of a Doctrine, whose Author cannot but *confess* it to be *different* from that of the Apostle.

Yet this Mr *H.* makes very light of: *It is easy he thinks to give a good Account of this single and only Difference.* However, let us see what Difference he owns; and I think it is a very material one, that *there is no Case put by St.* Paul *in express Words, in which* Opposition *to* Governors *is allowed.* That the Apostle should allow of no Case for Opposition to Governors, and Mr *H.*

* Page 35.

should

ſhould plead ſtrongly for it in ſeveral Caſes, is a Difference that I ſhould have thought it not *eaſy to give a good Account of.* Oh! ſays Mr *H.* but he does not put a Caſe *in expreſs Words.* And what ſhould his Readers underſtand by this, but that there is ſo much plainly intimated, tho' not delivered *totidem verbis?* I appeal to any impartial Judge, whether any other Senſe can be made of theſe Words, and whether Mr *H.* could have any other end in uſing them, than hereby to impoſe upon his leſs cautious Readers, as if the Apoſtle had hinted ſome ſuch exceptionable Caſe, tho' he had not expreſly ſtated it. And yet does Mr *H.* undertake to maintain any ſuch oblique Hint in the Apoſtle's Doctrine? By no means: For after he has inſinuated as if there were, in the very next Words he profeſſes to ſhew, that it was not neceſſary; and by conſequence the Apoſtle could not make any ſuch exception, without impertinently aſſerting an unneceſſary Doctrine. And for this weighty Reaſon, *becauſe there were none among the* Roman Heathens *themſelves who could bear with ſuch a Notion as this, That Subjects ought to ſuffer themſelves to be oppreſſed and made miſerable, without Reluctance, at the Will of their* Emperors. A powerful Argument indeed! The *Heathen Romans*, if they were at any time *oppreſſed and made miſerable by their Emperors*, ſuffered it not without uneaſineſs and *Reluctance.* This does not ſeem to reconcile the Difference betwixt the Apoſtle's Doctrine and Mr *H*'s. yet this is all the Words neceſſarily import. Nevertheleſs, let us take them in a higher Senſe, tho' not obliged to it, and ſuppoſe that by *Reluctance* is here meant, to include in it Forcible Reſiſtance; yet neither will this do Mr *H*'s Buſineſs, becauſe being no proof that the Apoſtle ought not to have made any exceptions, if he had intended them. Wherefore let us look again, and try if the next Words may not help him out. † *Nor was it the* Apoſtle's *Buſineſs to give an expreſs Allowance for* Reſiſtance *in ſuch a Caſe, becauſe*

† Page 36.

none

none of those to whom he wrote denied it, and all their Neighbours allowed it. This to me is as good an Argument, that S. *Paul* ought to have made exceptions to this Doctrine of Passive Submission, if he had intended any, that so *those to whom he wrote, and their Neighbours* about them, might not have any unnecessary Prejudices against Christianity laid in their way, as that he ought not to have made any, because they did not need them, as Mr *H.* supposes. But besides, Mr *H.* affirms, all those to whom the Apostle wrote, and all about them, to have been for Resistance upon occasion. Which I think must mean all the *Romans*, whether *Christians*, *Jews* or *Heathens*. If he say *All* the *Christians*, I should desire a little proof of this, and not a bare groundless Assertion, that *none of them denied it*; when it is so obvious to conclude from other places of Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, that they neither did, nor could grant it. If *All* the *Jews*, this likewise would need good proof, seeing their Law makes no allowance for it; so that the Patrons of Resistance are forced to leave the Canonical Scripture, and fly to the History of the *Maccabees*, for proof that they ever admitted it. Tho' if they had, this would have been no reason why the Apostle should not forbid them it entirely for the future. If the *Heathens All* granted it, it is yet incumbent upon Mr. *H.* to make it out, that this Perswasion was not one of those Errors the Apostle was sent to remove from amongst them, and that he did not purposely design to do it, in what he has here written to the *Romans*. That he did design it may justly be inferr'd from this one Observation, that the Converts to Christianity, whether *Greeks* or *Romans*, upon their embracing the Gospel, renounced their former Principles of Resistance, as will appear from the account I am to give hereafter, of the Behaviour of the Ancient Christians towards their mercileſs persecuting Emperors. For no other cause can be assigned of such an universal change in them, but that the Laws of their Religion imposed it upon them, as they would escape *the Damnation of Hell*, the Damnation threatned by St.

Paul

St. *Paul* to the Disobedient and Rebellious. His business was not to sooth Men in their Sins of whatever nature; but to condemn and dissuade from them, and press and urge to a renunciation of them. And when he has done this clearly and fully, it is highly unbecoming a Preacher of the Gospel, to evacuate his Precepts, by pleading that those he undertook to instruct at that time, or their Followers since, were not to understand him according to the plain literal meaning of his Words, but suitably to their own preconceived Erroneous Opinions. This is no better than to expound away the plainest Doctrines of the Gospel; and a ready way to render all that our Saviour and his Apostles have taught us of none effect. In as much as there is no reason, why all the other Precepts of our Religion may not in like manner be set aside by these Pretences, as of no use to those who are of a contrary Persuasion.

Mr. *H.* proceeds thus, * *He was to oppose another extream, which was the Opinion of those, who thought no Subjection due in Point of Conscience to* Heathen Magistrates, *even in the Execution of their Office. And the Resistance founded upon this Opinion, or any like to it, is the only Resistance which he here condemns, or which his Argument can conclude against.* This Plea has a particular respect to the *Jews*, and might have been of some force had this Epistle been written only to the *Jews* then at, or about *Rome*. But whosoever looks back to the first Chapter, will find *v.* 7. that it is directed *to all that were at Rome, beloved of God, called to be Saints*, that is, to all the Christians there without distinction, whether of *Jewish* or *Gentile* Extraction. Or if he look forward to the last Chapter, and observe the names of the Disciples there mentioned by the Apostle, he will see they are all *Greek* and *Latin* Names, but only *Mary*, or rather *Miriam*, *v.* 6. The like may be

* *Ibid.*

noted of the Concluſions of * others of his Epiſtles. And in the laſt Chapter to the *Philippians*, v. 22. the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Saints of *Nero*'s Houſhold, who, it is moſt reaſonably to be ſuppoſed, were Heathen not *Jewiſh* Converts. Whence it appears that the Convert *Jews* were but a Part, and in all probability but a ſmall Part of the Chriſtians then at *Rome*. And by conſequence it will be hard to conceive that the Apoſtle ſhould have had a regard only to them in this Precept, unleſs they had been ſome way particularly ſingled out from the reſt; which they are not. It ſeems rather to have been given upon the account of the Perſecutions, that the Chriſtians in general were like afterwards to undergo, from their cruel and tyrannical Governors, to prevent their ſeeking to redreſs themſelves by embroiling States, raiſing Inſurrections, and Tumults, or uſing any unlawful means for ſhaking off ſo heavy a Yoke. As alſo appears farther, from the Apoſtle's arguing for ſubmiſſion from the divine Inſtitution of Government. And it is ſtrange therefore that when the Apoſtle teaches, that *to reſiſt the Power is to reſiſt the Ordinance of God*, and a damning Sin, Mr. *H.* ſhould venture to affirm, that the Apoſtle does not deſign to forbid all Reſiſtance, but only to teach that ſome Obedience was due to *Heathen Magiſtrates*, who are to be ſubmitted to by their Subjects, ſo far only as they ſhall think it for their temporal Advantage. If the Apoſtle had meant no more than this, he could as eaſily have ſaid it as Mr. *H.* But when he does not ſay ſo, but ſays of Reſiſtance in general, that it is a heinous Offence, and exceeding Dangerous, that it is no leſs than a *Reſiſting God's Ordinance*, and expoſing our ſelves to his Eternal Vengeance, preſſing it in the moſt ſerious and important manner, and without any reſerve for the worſt of Princes, this ſeems a loud call to a Submiſſion of as large Extent, as the Words wherein it is required are

* 1 *Cor.* 16. *Coloſ.* 4. Where are only two *Hebrew* Names, *Barnabas*, and *Jeſus*, 2 Tim. 4.

of.

of. Nor is this truth in the leaſt contradicted by the Apoſtle's enforceing the Duty, by a farther conſideration of the Benefit of Government, and the good that thereby redounds to Society. Much leſs can it be diſproved, by whatſoever *Notion* Mr. *H.* may *have, of St.* Paul's *great regard for the* Rights and Liberties *of the Inferiour part of Mankind*; ſince it is plain the Apoſtle had a much greater concern upon him, for the Eternal Salvation of thoſe to whom he wrote, and was far more ſolicitous to preſerve them from *Damnation*, and teach them what they were to do for *Conſcience ſake*, and in order to the pleaſing Almighty God, and preparing themſelves for a better State; which he always looked upon to be infinitely beyond all the moſt valuable concerns of this poor, tranſient, uncertain Life.

What Mr. *H.* adds next, I readily aſſent to, that when S. *Peter tells us of ſome things* hard to be underſtood *in S.* Paul's *Writings, which the* Ignorant *and* Unlearned *in thoſe Days*, wreſted to their own Deſtruction, *I believe he little thought, that this Paſſage was ſo hard to be underſtood, that many even of the* Knowing *and* Learned *ſhould wreſt it.* Only I cannot add what he does, *not to their own Deſtruction, indeed, but to the* Deſtruction of whole Nations. For I am greatly afraid, if the Doctrine of Mr. *H.* and ſuch Expoſitors as he, were generally entertained, it would not only tend to the Deſtruction of whole Nations of their Followers, but to their Own in a more peculiar manner. Which I therefore moſt heartily beg of him ſeriouſly to conſider, before it be too late.

And now I think I may juſtly conclude this Point almoſt in Mr. *H's.* own words, Had not the Apoſtle been ſo expreſs as he is againſt all Reſiſtance, * *Yet for my own part (leaving others always to judge for themſelves) I cannot but think, had there been any ſuch Opinion as this* [of the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſting bad Governors] *amongſt thoſe to whom He wrote, that He of all Men,*

* Page 36.

would have set himself to oppose it, and with the greatest Zeal have condemned it: Such a Notion have I of his great regard to the eternal Happiness and Salvation, not only *of the Inferiour part*, but of all *Mankind.*

Here I might have taken notice of a Reflection not so very just, upon some Men; but whom, is as hard to discover, as who were his * many that instructed him so well in our old Laws; Of these *he cannot but observe that they hardly ever run their* Panegyricks *so high, or press Subjection so far, as in the case of those* Princes *who have the least Title to them.* But I let this pass.

3. *Having given an Account of the difference between the* Text *and the foregoing* Sermon; (though it had been much better they had not differed at all, and that he had no more varied from the Apostle than those he opposes do,) he next proceeds to *lay before the* Reader *the Words in which he has expressed his own Sense, upon the Subject of* Resistance, *that he may judge himself, how great a want of* Caution *there is in the choice of them.* To this end, passing over divers others already considered, he instances in this, † *Tamely to sit still, and see the* Happiness of Society *entirely ruined, and sacrificed to the irregular Will of one Man, seems a greater contradiction to the Will and Design of God, than any opposition can be. For it is a tacit Consent to the Ruine and Misery of Mankind. So that,* says he, *I blame not here a* Passive Non-resistance, *unless it be when a Society is entirely ruined without* Resistance.

1. This seems not well to consist with what he had said before, ‖ *If They* [Princes] *use their Power—— to the hurt and prejudice of* Humane Society, *they act not in any such instances by* Authority *from God: Nor can they in such instances be called his* Vicegerents, *without the highest Profaneness; And therefore to oppose them in such*

---

* Page 113.
† Pag. 38.
‖ Pag. 24.

cases

cases cannot be to oppose the Authority of God. In the one of these Cases Mr. *H.* makes a total Subversion necessary to legitimate Resistance; in the other it is sufficient that the Prince *use his Power to the hurt and prejudice of Humane Society*; which may be done several ways without a total Subversion. Here Mr. *H.* needs as much to be reconciled to himself, as he did before, to S. *Paul*. Nay, he says further, * *Subjects are not obliged to* Submission, *in point of Conscience, to those* Governors who answer not the end *of their Institution.* And what he means by this he explains a few lines after. *It is manifest that this Sentence frees* Subjects *from* Submission, *in Point of* Conscience, *to no* Governors, *but those only, under whom the* Universal Happiness of the Society *is not secured.* So that according to Mr. *H.* in this place, Subjects are not only discharged of all Duty to those Governors who seek *the Ruine, the entire Ruine of the Society*, as his forementioned Plea limits it, but to those too who do not duly apply themselves to the *Securing the Happiness of the Society.* Than which no Rebel will desire a greater Latitude for Resistance; since upon this Supposition he can never want a fair Pretence for it.

2. If no less than a *Total Subversion* will warrant Resistance, how will Mr. *H.* ever be able, according to his own Principles, to resist with a good Conscience before it is too late, and his Resistance will do him no longer any Good? Whilst the *Subversion* is but *in fieri*, it may meet with some Discouragement, that may alter the Sovereign's measures, or many other impediments may happen, that it may never come to be Total. And if it be not, Mr. *H*'s. Plea is plainly over-ruled by his own Confession.

3. If Resistance is not lawful but when the Society is *entirely ruined* without it, where will Mr. *H.* find a Prince to resist? For though many Princes have committed great outrages upon their Subjects, abused, im-

* Page 39.

poveriſhed, diſgraced and ſlain many of them, none have ever attempted to do this to their whole People. That would be to unking themſelves, to make them only nominal Princes, without Subjects either to obey them, or aſſiſt them in their Exigences. And no King in his wits would ever go about to degrade himſelf in ſuch a manner. It was as fooliſh, as barbarous a wiſh of *Caligula*, † that *the whole People of* Rome *had but one Neck*, that he might deſtroy them all at one blow. In as much as he could never have had a Will to extirpate all his People, if it could have been in his Power. As alſo on the other hand, if he had been ever ſo eagerly ſet upon doing it, he could never have it in his Power. Such wicked, tyrannical, cruel, inhumane Governors may do a great deal of Miſchief, and may totally ruine a great part of their Subjects. But ſtill this is not an *entire Ruine of the whole Society*; which Mr. *H.* in this place makes neceſſary in order to the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance. Nor is this Argument at all anſwered, *Pag.* 90, *&c.* for I do not pretend to deny that Princes may do many things againſt the Intereſt of the Publick; may go contrary to their known Duty in divers reſpects; and may have too often been obſerved to do ſo. Only I ſay that this is but to the Deſtruction of ſome of their Subjects, and the Damage of others, and not to the *entire Ruine* of all the Society.

3. Mr. *H.* has not acquainted us who is to be the Judge to determine what is an entire Subverſion, and when by virtue hereof the People may warrantably Reſiſt. This Queſtion he complains || *can be repeated, without the leaſt notice of what has been ſaid in anſwer to it.* And yet I muſt beg leave to repeat it again, and deſire to know of him, * with the learned Mr. *Leſley*, *Who ſhall be Judge?* For theſe following Reaſons.

---

† Utinam P. R. unam cervicem haberet. *Sueton.* in vit. C. *Calig.* c. 30.

|| Pref. *P.* xlii.

* *Rehearſals*, Vol. 3. Numb. 7, 12, 17, and Vol. 4. Numb. 4.

1. Becauſe

1. Because I do not observe any thing in all he has said that is at all a satisfactory Answer to it. I grant he affirms, † *The* Subjects *themselves* are to Judge; *who alone feel the necessity of it, and alone will suffer for the want of it.* And here he talks of *Infallibility*, and says, *no* Doctrine *was ever accounted false, because some People might mistake in the understanding or application of it*; and that *Private Persons are allowed to judge for themselves in matters of equal or greater moment or difficulty.* All which I take to be besides the Question, not because of their incapacity to judge aright, as he pretends some say, but because he does not shew they are ever allowed to judge for themselves in matters of *Meum* and *Tuum*; which he ought to have done, if he would be thought to answer this Question. And yet neither so had he answered it, though he had come nearer doing it, than he has now. He had not Answered it even then, I say, and for this plain Reason I say it, because he has not shewn any Authority the People have to Judge in this Case. They have Mr. *H*s. Commission for it; and || that is all the Commission they have, that I can find. And yet a Commission

† Page 171, &c.

|| *Bracton*, that old Lawyer his friends told him of, testifies that *contra ipsum* (De Leg. & Constit. Angl. l. 4. c. 10.) *non habebitur remedium per Assizam, immo tantum locus erit Supplicationi, ut factum suum corrigat & emendet, quod si non fecerit, sufficiat ei pro pœna, quod Dominum expectet ultorem, qui dicit, mihi vindictam, & ego retribuam; nisi sit qui dicat, quod universitas Regni & Baronagium suum hoc facere debeat, & possit in curia ipsius Regis.* Whether the Lords and Commons may appear in Court against the King in case of a disseizure by Assize, *Bracton* does not here determine. But in another place he delivers it as Law *l.* 1. *c.* 8. that none may question his procedure, much less set themselves to oppose it. *Si autem ab eo petatur,* (cum breve non *currat contra ipsum*) *locus erit supplicationi quod factum suum corrigat & emendet, quod quidem si non fecerit, satis sufficit ei ad pœnam*

quod

empowering them thus to Judge, is neceſſary, before they can warrantably take upon them to do it. For it is not their being certain of their Grievances will authorize them to act as Judges, unleſs the Laws of the Conſtitution confer this Right upon them. It oftentimes falls out that many of the Lawyers at the Barr, may be as well capacitated to give a right Judgment as any of thoſe upon the Bench, yet their Judgment ſignifies nothing at all towards the determining of a Suit, or the puniſhment of a Delinquent, becauſe they are not authorized to paſs a Sentence in either Caſe. And though Mr. *H. feel himſelf* ever ſo much aggrieved by any of his Neighbours, this will not bear him out in making repriſal, upon account of what he feels; but he muſt wait for the Determination of a legal Judge, before he can hope for reparation to be made him. This I think is enough to evince that the Peoples feeling themſelves diſtreſſed does not qualifie them to give a legal and valid Judgment, till they are appointed to do it by the Laws and Rules of the Conſtitution. And his Inſtances of the People's Judging who ſhall be their Prince in Kingdoms *perfectly Elective*, and here at home, who are fit to be our Repreſentatives in Parliament, are ſo far from eſtabliſhing his Aſſertion, that they are directly againſt him. The People do no more in either of theſe caſes, than what they are warranted to do by the Frame and Laws of their Conſtitution. And all that can be inferred from hence is, that where the People are conſtituted Judges of their Prince's good Behaviour, they may take upon them to act accordingly; but not in any other Caſe, not where the Conſtitution gives them no power to do it, and particularly not in our Nation, whoſe Law knows of no ſuch Judges.

---

quòd Dominum expectet ultorem. Nemo quidem de factis ſuis præſumat diſputare, multo fortius contra factum ſuum venire. This is Mr. *H's*. Old Lawyer who calls a Tyrannical King *the Miniſter of the Devil*; and yet I conceive he will not find much advantage in his Determination. Which poſſibly may be the Reaſon, why he choſe not to name him.

2. Be-

2. Becauſe to make the People Judges as Mr. *H.* does, is to appoint them to Judge in their own Cauſe; and ſo they become both Parties and Judges. And then it is eaſie to determine before hand for whom they will give their Judgment, whatever the Caſe be.

3. Becauſe it is not imaginable that our Laws which ordain Judges to determine any the leaſt Controverſie between the Subjects, would leave the King, † who is the Fountain of the Law, without any one to Judge for him, though in the weightieſt Concern. If the Law be ſo tender of the People's Intereſt, that one cannot have the leaſt part of his Eſtate recovered from him, but by a trial before a legal Judge empowered to give Sentence for or againſt him; who can believe the ſame Law ſhould leave the Sovereign without any redreſs againſt his Subjects, or any one or more appointed to give Judgment, when reſiſting him may be lawful, and when not? This to me makes it a clear Caſe that our Law knows no Reſiſtance. Which alſo is yet farther evident in that there is no Reſiſting in any Caſe, which our Law does not make Treaſon; and where it will not condemn the Reſiſter as a Traitor, if it have him in it's Power.

For theſe Reaſons I put this Queſtion again, and am perſwaded it ought to be put over and over again, till Mr. *H.* can give ſome more ſatisfactory Anſwer to it, than we have yet had either from himſelf, or any elſe. And this therefore is my third Objection to this Aſſertion of Mr. *H*'s. that we have no Judge appointed to determine when the Society is ſo *entirely ruined*, as that the People may ſafely, and with a good Conſcience, take upon them to Reſiſt their Sovereign.

4. In the fourth and laſt place I add, that Mr. *H*'s. Doctrine opens a Door for Reſiſting not only the King, or Queen, but (which perhaps his Admirers have little attended to) both Houſes of Parliament too, whenſo-

† Our Law books call *the King the Fountain of Juſtice and the Life of the Law.* Jenkin*s* Rediviv. P. 77. *He is fons legum.* Symmons's Loyal Subjects belief, *p.* 8.

ever

ever the People see themselves Oppressed by them. Had *Julian Johnson* been now alive, how would he have rebuked him for this New Heterodoxy, so far beyond what he had ever pretended to? But so it is, And as much as Mr. *H.* commends the Queen and her Administration, if it could be supposed to happen that upon any turn of Affairs, he should apprehend the Queen and both Houses to enact any Laws that might be to the hurt and ruine of the People, (though themselves had another Notion of it, and designed ever so well in it) if he will be true to his own Principles, he is bound to Preach up Resistance against them. So that in this Case he declares open War, against both Queen and Parliament, if they do not order things, as he judges may be for the Benefit and Welfare of the Publick. For *thus he speaks*; * *should all who are possessed of Power, in any other Form of Government*, [than that of an Absolute Monarchy] *consent, and agree, to enslave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and to make them miserable; there is nothing in Nature, or in the Christian Religion, that can hinder the People from redressing their Grievances; and from answering the Will of Almighty God, so far as to preserve, and secure the Happiness of the Publick Society.* Such is the tendency of his Doctrine, such the extent of his Resistance, and such the mighty regard he has for our Laws and Constitution.

So that upon the whole, Mr *H.* has not approved himself so very *cautious and prudent* in what he has Discoursed upon this Argument. For after all his Flourishes to the contrary, he is forced to own a Difference betwixt his Text and his Sermon; and it is plain this Difference remains yet vastly great, the One being in truth no less than a flat Contradiction to the Other. The Apostle forbids all Resisting the *Higher Powers* upon pain of *Damnation*; but Mr. *H.* allows to resist and depose them, whensoever *they consent or agree to enslave the People committed to their Care*, that is to say, when-

* *Page* 10, and again *Pag.* 38.

soever

ſoever their Sovereign Lords the People ſhall conceive them to have thus *Agreed*. I ſhould have been very glad if I could, according to Mr. *H*'s. ‖ deſire, *have ſhewn People that no ſuch Doctrines can be built upon his* Sermon, [I add, or Vindication] *or receive any encouragement from* them, or either of them. But the Reader ſees by this time, it is not in my power; They are too plainly taught and encouraged in Both.

CHAP. VII.

Whether Mr. H. *has faithfully expounded the Words of the Apoſtle*, Rom. 13. 1, *&c.*

IN the next place Mr. *H.* proceeds to the Words of his Text, and ſummons all his Ingenuity and Skill to wreſt them to a meaning, that himſelf acknowledges † to be different from what they ſeem to import, but in reality from what is the natural Importance of them. A true and genuine Paraphraſe of them would not ſerve his Scheme; and ſince that muſt be right, whatever the Doctrine of the Apoſtle be, he ſets himſelf with all his might, to fix a Senſe upon his Text, which it never was intended to bear, nor is any more capable of, as I have obſerved already, than the Second Commandment is of allowing the Worſhip of Images in times of great Danger and Perſecution, the Sixth of admitting of Murder upon a high Provocation, or the Seventh of Diſpenſing with Adultery, or at leaſt with ſimple Fornication, when under a ſtrong Temptation to it.

‖ Page 40.

† Page 7.

When

When a Precept or Prohibition is delivered in as expreſs and poſitive words as can be, and no Immorality, or natural Abſurdity implied in the literal Senſe of the Words, nor any Reſtriction in other parts of Scripture to limit it, if this be not to be taken in its full ſcope, and without Reſervation or Exception, Mr. *H.* would do well to let us know, how we may be able to diſtinguiſh what Injunctions are really Univerſal and Unlimited, and which not, leſt otherwiſe his way of Expounding open a wide door for Lewdneſs, Theft, Blaſphemy, Murder, Idolatry, and all ſorts of Impieties to enter in; which I take to be a matter that as well deſerves his regard, as the temporal ſecular Intereſts of Publick Societies. However, let us ſee what he makes of the Words he has undertaken to explain. And ſo we ſhall find, that as the Author of *Popery Miſrepreſented and Repreſented*, ſet before his Reader a twofold Character of Popery, but both of them far from being a true Character of it, that ſo the unwary Reader might by this Artifice be the more eaſily won over to his ſide; So Mr. *H.* here undertakes a twofold Interpretation of the Seven firſt Verſes of the Chapter; ſuch as himſelf *thinks the only juſt and reaſonable* one; and ſuch as he is pleaſed to draw up for thoſe of a contrary Opinion, *which* in his judgment * *they muſt give if they will be conſiſtent with themſelves*, but which he teſtifies for them that they have *never actually given*, and he may be ſure they never will give; the one ſo very partial and forced, and the other ſo unlike what his Oppoſites would ſay for themſelves, or can approve of, that I ſhall not trouble the Reader with the Repetition of them. But ſhall only make ſome few Obſervations on the former, and then ſubjoin ſuch a plain Expoſition of the Apoſtle's Words, as ſeems beſt to ſuit with the genuine and natural Deſign and Importance of them.

---

* Pref. Pag. *XXXIII.*

1. And

1. And in the first Place I observe, that Mr *H.* founds his whole Exposition upon a groundless Supposal, that this Command was entirely owing to a certain † Notion that had obtain'd amongst the *Jews*, that *no Subjection was due to* Heathen Magistrates *in the Execution of their Office.* He adds, that this same Notion *remained even amongst those of them who were converted to the* Christian Religion; and that *to stop this pernicious Opinion, and remove the Scandal it might fix upon* Christianity, the Apostle *gave this Charge to all* Christians. Yet has he not given any proof, either that the Apostle had any regard to this *Jewish* Notion, nor that the *Christians* did retain it; as he ought in common Prudence to have done, before he undertook to raise his whole Fabrick upon it: Nay, so diffident is he of this his first Principle, that he pretends to throw it off, as *of small Importance to his Interpretation.* And yet it is notorious, that not only his Comment upon the first Verse is purely built upon it, but moreover, *v. 6.* he repeats it again without any the least hesitation, as he does also upon other Occasions; as if it were a most undoubted truth, and himself had never intimated any the least distrust concerning it.

I have already observ'd, that this Epistle was directed || to all the Christians at *Rome*; and can it be thought the Apostle would, without taking any manner of Notice, or giving the least hint of it, accommodate himself to the particular case of the *Jews*, that were scattered amongst them, and probably were, as I have said, but a small part of them? And I appeal to Mr *H.* whether, upon farther Consideration, he can in his Conscience Sincerely, and *bonâ fide* believe it.

2. In his Paraphrase upon the first Verse, speaking of the Subjection due to Magistrates, he slides in these Words, as if they had been the Apostle's, *in the executi-*

† Page 41.

|| πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις. *Ch.* 1, *v.* 7.

on

on of their Office, and again, *considered as Magistrates*; which was done meerly to serve his own Hypothesis, and make the Reader conceive these Restrictions to be in the Text. Whereas he knows very well there is not a word of either of these Passages there, but they are pure additions of his own inventing.

3. On the second Verse he again brings in, *in the execution of their Office*; and for the same reason as before, tho' whether so *cautiously and prudently* as he may think, I would desire him to consider. For I am apt to believe, that both here and in the former Verse, they will reach farther than he intended them, or will pretend to justify the extent of them: For I cannot but think the Learned Mr *Milbourn*'s Observation to be very just, || that this Exposition leaves the Prince liable to be resisted, *when he is diverting himself, or engaged in any* private Business, *which has no relation to the Publick Government.* And if he had added, when asleep or sick upon his Bed, I know not how Mr *H.* would answer it, seeing in neither of these Cases he *is in the execution of his Office.* Here likewise Mr *H.* varies from our Translation, in rendering the word κρίμα *Judgment*; but since he allows it to be *Judgment and due Punishment from God himself*, and * has before own'd it to mean *Damnation*, I shall have no difference with him about this.

4. Upon the third Verse I meet with a Passage, that to my Understanding, needs a little Explication. Where speaking of *Heathen Magistrates*, he gives this caution; *You very much mistake the Business, if you look upon them as Enemies by their Office to what is truly Good and Praise-Worthy.* Which Words must mean, either that *Heathen Magistrates*, whilst they remain such, for this his own Words suppose when he calls them *Heathen Magistrates*; they must mean, I say, that Heathen Magistrates remaining such, were by their Office, to promote Chri-

|| *Measures of Resistance*, p. 7.

* *Page* 11, *and* 35.

stianity

ſtianity by all means in their Power, as what would certainly have been moſt for the Advantage of their Society, that is to ſay, they were to act againſt their own Judgment, and ſet up what they believed a Falſe Religion; which Mr *H.* will not ſay they ought to have done, whilſt they continued of that Perſwaſion. Or elſe they were to promote and encourage what themſelves thought to be good and Praiſe-worthy. And if this be all that is intended, Mr *H.* will not eaſily inſtance in any Prince whatſoever, who, tho' he may have done many extravagant and unjuſt things for his own Humour, has not yet in the main been an Encourager of what he apprehended to be for the advantage of his Dominions, whether really ſo or not. At leaſt, this Doctrine will make a Prince to be irreſiſtible, tho' he actually ſubvert the Laws and Conſtitution, and ſet up a new Form of Government, or a new Religion, ſo long as he conceives all this to be for the benefit of his Subjects. And what then becomes of Mr *H*'s. Doctrine of Reſiſtance?

5. Mr *H.* at the 6th and 7th Pages of his Sermon, has found out an Interpretation for theſe Words, *Ye muſt needs be Subject, not only for Wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake*, that one of leſs Ingenuity than himſelf would hardly have hit upon, *that is, It is your Duty to obey the Supreme* Power, *becauſe the great End of all humane* Authority *is the Good of the Publick; that honeſt Men may be protected in their Properties, and all Violence and Diſorder, and Unhappineſs in humane Society be prevented and puniſhed; and becauſe it is your Duty to promote that good End.* This with Mr *H.* is to be *Subject for Conſcience ſake.* And here again to the ſame purpoſe, * he makes *the Office of* Magiſtrates *to be the Ordinance of God*, not be-

* *Page* 43, 44.

cauſe

cause the *Higher Powers* are † ὑπὸ τῦ θεῦ τεταγμένοι, appointed *by God* as his *Ministers*, or as the Words will as well bear, appointed *under God* as his Lieutenants, his Vice-gerents and Representatives, his Deputies and Viceroys; but only *as it carries forward his Designs in the World.* Which *Judas* did in betraying our Blessed Lord; and yet Mr *H.* will not say, he was *ordained by God* to do this great Wickedness: Yet for ought I see, Mr *H.* makes him in this place as much the *Ordinance of God*, as he will allow the most Lawful Sovereign to be.

6. The same thing he repeats in other Words upon the next Verse. But since he offers nothing new, the same Answer may serve here.

7. And again upon the last of his Seven Verses, he insists, That *Governors are cloathed with Power for the good of Humane Society*, as if this were the only End of their Power. This he has affirm'd, and goes on constantly to affirm it; and tho' he has been told, that this is not the only, nor the main End of Submission to Governors, and tho' the Words of his Text are clear and full against him, he is still resolved not to quit his Point. He has imbib'd this false Notion, and it is so dear to him that he knows not how to part with it, whatever Evidence is brought against it. Thus much concerning Mr *H.*'s Paraphrase upon the Apostle's Words, which he gives out to be the *only Just and Reasonable One*; how justly and reasonably the Reader may see by this time.

Next follows that which he has drawn up for the Adversaries of Resistance, which he has endeavoured to make as ridiculous as he could, whereby to expose them

† Paulus nullum ait Imperium nunc contingere, nisi Deo autoritatem ei suam dante, sicut Rex dat Præsidibus; quod ut rectiùs intelligatur, addit, *omnia Imperia quæ sunt*, i. e. quamdiu manent ac durant, *à Deo constituí*, i. e. autoritatem suam accipere, non minùs quàm si Reges illi per Prophetas uncti essent, ut quidam *Syriæ* Reges. M. Pol. in loc.

to

to the contempt of his injudicious and less considerate Readers. But this being not only what, as he owns, none of them have ever said, but what according to their Principles, it cannot be expected that any of them should say, I therefore pass it by, and proceed to shew what is the true meaning of these Words of the Apostle.

1. *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers: for there are no Powers but of God; and the Powers that be are ordained of God.*

1. Remember this is one necessary Branch of that Holy Doctrine our Blessed Saviour delivered to his Disciples, and to the Conscientious observance whereof you are all indispensably obliged, that every one of you, * high or low, rich or poor, Lay or Clergy, all in whatever Station or Condition, must pay a constant Obedience to such Governors, whether Christians or Heathens, as it pleases God to set over you: For they are His Ministers and Representatives, and upon this account have a Right to your Allegiance; which must by no means be denied them by such as call themselves our Lord's Disciples, and hope to partake of his Salvation.

2. *Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

2. So that there is no resisting the Governors thus instituted by God, without at the same time resisting God who has instituted them, and has appointed them to Rule in his stead, and by his Authority. And all that shall incur the guilt of such Resistance, do in a manner set themselves in Battel array against God; they *resist his Ordinance*, and for so doing shall, besides all Temporal Punishments in this World, be condemned to everlasting Torments in the next.

---

* Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω· κἂν ἀπόστολος ᾖ, κἂν εὐαγγελιστὴς, κἂν προφήτης, κἂν ὁστισοῦν. B. Chrysost. in loc.

3. *For Rulers are not a terrour to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the Power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same.*

3. Here you see is one invincible Reason for Submission to Authority. And now I add another, || by way of encouragement to a chearful compliance herein; namely, that *Rulers are* by Designation and Appointment, the Generality of them are in Fact and Reality, and the very worst, such as *Tiberius* and *Caligula*, *Claudius* and *Nero*, are in some measure, † a *terrour* rather *to evil than to well doers*; the most outrageous Tyrants being less pernicious to any Nation or Kingdom, than a Liberty for *every one to do that which is right in his own Eyes*, as is usual where there is no King or other Supream Magistrate amongst them.

The Laws of all Nations are usually so contrived, as to encourage Virtue and Probity in the main, and to discountenance, condemn, and punish Vice. And no Princes and Governors are so bad, as that more are not benefited, than injured by them. Their own Interest, Safety, and Convenience call upon them to have a regard to the Welfare of their People; which they will not wholly neglect. And though they may do many things detrimental to it, yet ordinarily it may be observed that the likeliest way to be rewarded by Good Rulers, and to escape the better under the Bad, is to be careful of your Duty towards them; this being a sure way of recommending your selves to the former, and the readiest course you can take to mollifie and appease the latter, and thereby of preventing the Evils you might otherwise have met with.

|| Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ, βαθεῖαν ἔδωκε τῷ πλημμύρᾳ, καὶ κατέπληξεν αὐτὸς, πάλιν ἀνίησιν, ἅσπερ σοφὸς ἰατρὸς φάρμακα μετὰ πολλὴν πάθεις, &c. Id.

† Μεγάλως γὰρ ἐνεργετοῦσιν ἡμᾶς οἱ ἄρχοντες, δι' αὐτῶν γὰρ ὁ βίος ἡμῶν σωίζεται· ὡς εἰ γε μὴ ἦσαν, πάντα ἂν ἦν ἄτακτα, καὶ σωματωτέρων τῶν ἀδυνατωτέρους καταπονούντων, δίκαιον ἐχόντων. Oecumen. in v. 5.

4. For

4. *For he is the Minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid, for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the Minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil.*

4. For he [the Ruler] is appointed by God for the Subjects Good; and generally speaking he is so to a considerable degree. So that a good Behaviour, a prudent and quiet, submissive and dutiful Deportment in your several Stations, whatever they be, will hardly fail of turning to your own Advantage. As also on the other hand, he has the Sword committed to him by God, for the Punishment of Traitours, and Rebels, and other Malefactors, who must expect to suffer for their Offences; this being a necessary part of the Magistrate's Duty, and from which no bad Subject ought in any wise to think himself secure.

5. *Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.*

5. So that upon the whole it is evident, that all Subjects are bound in point of Conscience, and out of a Sense of Duty to Almighty God, whose Vicegerents Kings and other supream Rulers are, as well as in order to their own present Safety, to pay them all Allegiance; and *be* so *subject* to them as to obey all their lawful and just Commands, and patiently submit to the Penalties that may follow upon the Non-observance of those which are unlawful; so as never to rise up against them, or use any violence and injustice towards them; but trust rather to God's good Providence and Protection, who will certainly cause * *all things to work together for good to them that love him*, whose Ordinance is slighted and affronted by Resistance, and who they may be sure will find out a way to punish them severely for it.

6. *For for this cause pay you tribute also; for they are God's Ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.*

6. Upon this last Consideration of your being *subject for Conscience sake*, you are to *pay Tribute* like-

* Rom. 8. 28.

wise for the necessary support of the Government. You are to look upon Princes as God's Ministers, engaged in a Business, which they are forced to give great attendance to, and must therefore have due Supplies administred accordingly.

7. *Render therefore to all their dues; Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.*

7. Wherefore be ye always ready to render, as a Debt owing to them, all such Payments as are thus necessary for the Maintenance of their Government and Authority; together with all that Honour and Reverence that belongs to their high Station, and the Power committed to them.

This is a plain and natural Exposition of the Words. And it is easie to see by it, how Mr. *H.* has been put to it to wrest them to an improper Sense, that he might make them suit with his Doctrine of Resistance. For hereby it appears there is not one word in the Apostle that encourages Opposition to Governours, but all is against it. And whereas Mr. *H.* makes a notion of the *Jews* to be the occasion of the Apostle's thus teaching the *Romans*, † *Oecumenius* gives another account of it. He observes how naturally this Injunction of Obedience to Authority follows upon the conclusion of the foregoing Chapter; in that as our Religion requires Love and Forgiveness of our Enemies, and a Forbearance to requite their ill turns, so does it more especially a due Regard and Submission to our Superiours, to whom, as such, all stand particularly engaged. And

---

† Ἐπειδὴ ἱκανῶς κατήρτισε τὰ ἤθη τῶν ἀκουόντων, καὶ ἐδίδαξεν αὐτὲς καὶ ἐχθρῶς εἶναι ἐυμενεῖς, εἰσάγει καὶ ταύτην τὴν παραίνεσιν, παιδεύων πᾶσαν ψυχὴν, κἂν ἱερεὺς ᾖ, κἂν μοναχὸς, κἂν Ἀπόστολος, ὑποτάσσεσθαι τοῖς ἄρχουσιν. Oecum. in v. 1.

S.

S. || *Chryſoſtom* long before tells us, this is a Topick our Apoſtle inſiſts much upon in others alſo of his Epiſtles, giving the Chriſtians to underſtand that our Saviour did not deſign to exempt his followers from thoſe natural Obligations Inferiours are under to their Superiours, but on the contrary *as he at other times requires Servants to be ſubject to their Maſters, ſo does he here enjoin the ſame ſubjection to thoſe in Power and Authority*; plainly implying that our Religion earneſtly preſſes this Duty, and is ſo far from diſcharging Subjects from their former Obligations, that it lays a much ſtricter tye upon them, and makes all their Offences of this ſort exceedingly more offenſive and more dangerous, than they had been before. And one who had heard nothing of this Controverſie could hardly avoid believing, that the bare reading the two firſt Verſes of the Chapter, muſt eternally ſilence all pretences to the contrary, they are ſo expreſs and poſitive againſt all Reſiſtance.

However this is not enough to ſatisfie Mr. *H.* but he comes on anew, full flushed with a ſet of Arguments, that he ſeems to promiſe himſelf will do mighty execution, ſuch as that the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance muſt inevitably fall before them. Wherefore that he may not complain, I have over-looked any thing he ſeems to lay a ſtreſs upon, I muſt ſpend a few Leaves upon theſe. And accordingly I deſign the conſideration of them for the Buſineſs of the next Chapter.

|| Πολὺν τῦ περίγματ@ τότε ποιῆται λόγον ϗ ἐν ἑτέραις ἐπιστολαῖς, καθάπερ τὲς οἰκέτας τοῖς δεσπόταις, ἕτω ϗ τὲς ἀρχομένυς τοῖς ἄρχυσιν ὑποτάττων. B. Chryſoſt. in loc.

CHAP. VIII.

Whether Mr. H's. *several Arguments do sufficiently disprove the Doctrine of Non-Resistance?*

HERE I am to examine the several Arguments Mr. *H.* brings towards the latter end of his second Chapter, in vindication of his former Doctrine, against Passive Obedience and Non-resistance. And I shall do it as briefly as I can.

I. He argues, * in relation to *Nero*, most probably the Emperor at *Rome* when this Epistle was written. And here he pleads

1. That *his Personal Vices will not affect this matter, unless they were such as rendered him a settled Enemy to the Publick Happiness.* What he means by *a settled Enemy to the Publick Happiness* I know not. But this I know, that, if he did not attend perpetually to the business of his Government, *watching continually for the Good and Happiness of humane Society*, he stands condemned by Mr. *H.* himself, as *not the Governor S.* Paul *means in this place, or to whom he here presses Obedience.* This he tells us expressly *Pag.* 21. of his *Measures of Submission.* I know again, that *so far as he Deflects from promoting the Publick Good, so far* he is pronounced by the same Mr. *H. to lose his Title to these Declarations* of the Apostle, *Pag.* 24. Whether Mr. *H.* will allow him that goes thus far only to be *a settled Enemy to the Publick Good*, he has not told us; but I think he has plainly enough told us that he is resistible. And if *Nero's Personal Vices* carried him thus far, *they will* certainly *affect this matter.*

* Page 48.

2 If

2. If he were such a Magistrate as set himself to act contrary to the *End of his Office, it is impossible says* Mr. *H. S.* Paul *should mean him particularly in this place.* If by *meaning in particular*, he intend meaning him alone, I know none that pretends it; but if he intends him amongst others, this must be allowed (if he were then Emperor) till Mr. *H.* can prove the *Powers that be*, not to mean the Governors in being at that time. Besides, does Mr. *H.* think the Apostle designed in these words to teach Resistance of the Emperor then in being? If he does, he has a very peculiar way of thinking, and must excuse the rest of the World, if they cannot concur with him in so extravagant a Notion. If he does not think it, he must own the Emperor then being, how bad soever, to be the Power that was at that time to be owned at *Rome*, and to whom Subjection was to be paid through the Empire.

As to what the Apostle speaks of Rulers being a *Terror not to Good works, but to the Evil*, I have already considered it; and I do not think I am bound to repeat my Answer every time Mr. *H.* does his Objection.

3. Again says Mr. *H.* If the *Roman Emperor at this time were guilty* of any *Instances of* Tyranny and Oppression, *and did in his general Behaviour consult the* Publick Happiness, *S.* Paul's *Reasoning here will not so much as make it a necessary part of Duty to submit to him in those Instances of* Tyranny *and* Oppression. How does this agree with what is affirmed, but in the Page before, that *Those Vices which do not render him a settled Enemy to the* Publick Happiness, *will not affect this matter?* If this be not playing fast and loose, saying and unsaying, What is?

4. His Fourth Argument is, That Bishop *Pearson* fixes the time of the Writing this Epistle, in the Third Year of *Nero*. To which I answer,

1. All do not agree in this, and I hope Mr. *H.* will not make a moral Duty to depend entirely upon the uncertain Conjectures of Chronologers, how great soever.

2. Does Mr. *H.* believe in his Conſcience that St. *Paul* would lay down a Precept, with deſign it ſhould be obſerved only for two or three Years, or not rather for a Perpetuity?

3. Did *Nero* behave himſelf ſo well during his firſt Five Years as never to *deflect from the Will of God*, or be *guilty of any Inſtances of* Tyranny *and* Oppreſſion? If he were not more circumſpect than this comes to, this Obſervation according to Mr. *H*'s. own Doctrine, will ſtand him in little ſtead. Yet * *Tacitus* relates of him, that in the Conſulſhip of *Q. Voluſius* and *P. Scipio*, which I take to be in the ſecond Year of his Reign, he viſited the *Stews* and other by-places, in diſguiſe, attended with ſuch as laid hold of what goods came in their way, falling upon and wounding thoſe they met with in their rambles; both Men and Women of Quality being aſſaulted by them; hereby encouraging others to the like Diſorders. Does not Mr. *H.* reckon this *a Deflecting from God's Will?* Or does he allow it to be *an attending continually upon this very thing?* If the former, then *Nero* upon his Principles was reſiſtible in his *Quinquennium*, notwithſtanding S *Paul*'s Prohibition of Reſiſtance. If the latter, how ſhall we know when it is a Prince firſt becomes Reſiſtible? Was *Nero* in this *a Terror to Evil works?* On the other hand, was it not *Profaneneſs* and *Blaſphemy, to ſay he acted by God's Authority in theſe Inſtances*? How then could he be irreſiſtible? Was this really *promoting the Publick Good?* If not, whatſoever *Reputation* he might have *obtained for Virtue, and Good Nature, and Generoſity*, I have Mr. *H*'s. Authority to tell him, † that he *had loſt his Title to theſe Declarations of the Apoſtle*, which forbad to take up Arms againſt him; And again, that *Acting* in this manner *contrary to the End of his Office*, ‖ *it was impoſſible S.* Paul *ſhould mean*

* Annal. L. 13. P. 222.
† Page 24.
‖ Page 48.

him

him particularly in this Place. And then I perſwade my ſelf Mr. *H.* muſt allow he might be reſiſted, for theſe Pranks; though he had not || *entirely ruined the Happineſs of the Society.*

5. Mr. *H.* proceeds, *It doth not appear that the Form of Government was as yet ſo altered, as that the Roman Emperour was then abſolute, and without controul by the Laws then in Force.*

1. If Mr. *H.* could make it out that *Nero* by the Laws of the Empire was accountable to the *Senate*, as the Kings of *Sparta* were to the *Ephori*, and as the *Doge* of *Venice* is now to their Senate, and the Kings of *Poland* to their Conſtituents, all that would follow from hence would be only that he was not the *Higher Power*, (* that is to ſay *the Higheſt*, for ſo the words certainly mean,) not that the *Higher Power* might be reſiſted, which is the Point he was to maintain.

2. Or if he could ſhew the *Senate* to be Sharers with him in the Government, yet this would not at all prove that both together being the *Higher Powers* were not irreſiſtible. And it is only the irreſiſtibility of the *Higher Powers* that I plead for, whereſoever or in whomſoever it be placed.

3 Mr. *H*'s. ſaying, *It does not appear*, is no proof that *Nero* was not an Abſolute Monarch; and yet unleſs he could have proved that, I ſee not of what uſe he could expect this Inſtance to be to him.

His Sixth Plea can ſignifie nothing at all, till he ſhall have firſt proved, what he began his Paraphraſe with, but will never be able to prove, that the Notion of ſome of the *Jews*, concerning the Unlawfulneſs of obeying Governors who were not of their own Nation, was the occaſion of S. *Paul*'s giving this Precept for Submiſſion to the *Higher Powers.*

|| Page 38.

* ὑπερεχούσαις ἐξουσίαις.

7. In

7. In the next place Mr. *H.* affirms this Precept to be given only for the ſake of thoſe *who acknowledged no Submiſſion due to Governors, in point of Conſcience, from the End of their Inſtitution, and the Uſefulneſs of their Office*, quite dropping his Text, and the principal Ground of this Submiſſion, that Governors are *the Ordinance of God*, and upon this account are not to be reſiſted. For ſo are the Apoſtle's Words, *Whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, and they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.*

8. Mr. *H.* is got to his *Jews* again, from whoſe Notion he collects, juſt with the ſame ſtrength of Argument he has done ſeveral times before, that *conſidering what a handle was hereby given to miſrepreſent the* Chriſtian Religion *as an Enemy to Government, S.* Paul *could not well ſay leſs upon this Subject than he here doth:* Whereto I anſwer, that as Mr. *H.* has not proved, nor ever can prove, that the Notion of the *Jews* concerning Obedience to Governors was the true cauſe of what the Apoſtle here enjoins, and ſo his Argument falls to the ground; ſo on the other hand, conſidering the Divine Inſtitution of Government, the Apoſtle could not well ſay near ſo little here as Mr. *H.* would have him. He could not ſay leſs than that God's Miniſter, whoſoever he be, muſt needs be irreſiſtible, till it pleaſes his Supream Lord to remove him from his Station. Nor could he have avoided the ſcandalizing all the Princes in the World, and eſpecially the *Roman* Emperor, and rendering our Religion a great Offence to them, if he had given Subjects free liberty to Rebell, or in Mr. *H*'s Language to Reſiſt any of them, ſo oft as they ſhould ſee them *Deflecting from the Will of God*, and not ſo ſolicitous for promoting the *Publick Welfare and Happineſs* as they ought to be.

9. *The Romans*, ſays Mr. *H. were the greateſt Friends to* Liberty, *and to their own* Rights *even at this time*, and could not be ſuppoſed to *bear ſuch a Notion, as that they were left entirely at the Mercy of their* Emperors. *The contrary is manifeſt from their general Abhorrence*

horrence of Nero, *and their Defection from him*, and the Senate's *declaring him a Publick Enemy*. And thus it seems according to Mr. *H.* the Christian Loyalty was to be adapted just to their Notions, and not carried a step higher than it was with that People. They had Stews too, amongst them for Lust, and *Circs* for Cruelty and Barbarity, and false Gods and their Temples for Idolatry; and is it not to all intents and purposes as good an Argument against the Apostle's condemning these, as against condemning Resistance, that the *Romans* would be offended at him for so doing? But his Office was not to favour their Errors or Vices of whatever sort, but plainly to lay the Will and Word of God before so many as would attend to it; and not be overawed by others, but leave the Event of all to Almighty God, * *whose he was, and whom he served.*

And yet whatever fear of Offending there might be, and so far as that might in any case be attended to, one would think there was much less Danger in Offending their Fellow-Subjects, than their Prince, who had it in his Power to exercise the utmost Severities upon the Christians, and upon Multitudes of them at once, as they oftentimes found to their Cost. Nor could the Apostles have taken a more probable Course to have themselves and their Religion together extirpated out of the World, than if by teaching, as Mr. *H.* does, the Doctrine of Resistance, they had set all the Princes upon Earth against them; and had at the same time forfeited all pretence to the Divine Protection, by Preaching up Rebellion against his *Ordinance.*

10. But Mr. *H.* is of Opinion, † that *this Doctrine of Non-resistance, though delivered in general terms by the Apostle, is not yet to be understood* without Restriction.

---

* Act. 27. 23.

† Page 53.

1. Because

1. Because of *the great Absurdity of making the Christian Religion an Enemy to the happiness of Humane Society.* But what if this Doctrine of Non-resistance, be not such an Enemy to Humane Society, as Mr. *H.* supposes? Then this Argument falls to the Ground. Farther, what if the Prohibition of Resistance be really for the Benefit of Humane Society? I have seriously considered this matter, and think it were no difficult task at all to maintain that it is so. I also very well know, what Mr. *H.* has said against it, and could easily Answer any Argument I meet with in him, and shall effectually do it in what I have to offer toward the latter end of this Treatise. At present I choose rather to pass it by, and only refer the Reader to a few Pages in Dr. *Hickes's Jovian*, Ch. 11. P. 256, to the end of the Chapter, and to Dr. *Falkner's Christian Loyalty*, B. 2. Ch. 2. Sect. 3. P. 389, *&c.* in both which Learned Authors he will find such a brief account of the Mischiefs of Rebellion, as will need some farther answer, than has been yet given.

Whereto I only add, y^t Queen *Mary's* is justly complained of as the cruellest and most destructive Persecution that has been known in this Nation for many Ages. And yet as the Lord Bishop of *Sarum* observes from Mr. *Fox*, † the Number of the Martyred then were but 72, the first Year of this Persecution, 94 the second, 79 the next, and 39 the last; in all 284. A small number in comparison of what might be expected to fall in but one pitched Battel! Besides that when the Sword is once unsheathed, no one knows how many Battels may ensue, and what other outrages and devastations may be made before it be put up again. Not to say, that the Divine Blessing and Protection may far better be expected by such as suffer in Obedience to his Command, than by those that fight against it.

---

† Hist. of the Reformation, Part 2. Book 2. Page 364.

So

So that here is no such absurdity, as he *imagines*, whereby to limit this general Precept of the Apostle.

2. Because *the Reasoning of S.* Paul *in this place doth happily prevent this Objection.* Whereto I shall only rejoin, that the *Reasoning of S.* Paul *in this place does happily* establish our Doctrine of Non-resistance. *For he not only commands* Submission, *but lays open the grounds on which it is due; and these grounds, as I have already observed, are such as* manifestly *infer the Necessity of* Non-resistance *in all Cases.*

3. Because *the very Persons who blame all Restriction in this Place, where the Discourse of S.* Paul *himself makes it necessary, are obliged to allow Restrictions in many other Points, where there is no such express Reasoning to make it necessary.* Now if there be nothing in S. *Paul's* Reasoning to make this Restriction necessary, as I presume I have fully proved there is not, and the other places here appealed to are either not to be restrained, or the Restriction of them is manifestly taught in other places of Scripture, this Argument must necessarily fall to the Ground. And that this is the true state of the Case, a little inspection into the Texts alledged will sufficiently inform us.

1. The first is concerning *the Obedience of* Children *to* Parents, *and* Servants *to* Masters. Which though delivered in general terms, must be restrained by reason of the Obligation they are under to *obey God rather than Man.* According to which, these Expressions, how general soever, cannot possibly oblige to the observance of any Command they know to be unlawful. These words, as *Thomas Aquinas* * well observes, are to be understood to relate to those things *quæ pertinent ad jus patriæ vel dominativæ potestatis, which belong to the power of a Parent or Ruler*; He had noted a little before, that a Proconsul's Commands are of no force in opposition to those of the Emperor whose Minister he is. Which is a great truth; and such as makes it very

* 22dæ q. 104. Art. 5.

plain,

plain, that the command of a Parent or Master is of little force against the Prohibition of Almighty God. But where is the Prohibition of Passive Obedience? It is not so much as pretended that Christians are any where in Scripture forbid to suffer wrongfully, or required to rise up in Arms against a Tyrannical Sovereign; which were absolutely necessary to make these Instances parallel.

2 His next Instance is in those Words of our Saviour, † *Swear not at all*, which considered in it self is certainly a general Prohibition. But if we attend to the occasion of it; and that in all probability it is levelled || not only against common Swearing in ordinary Conversation, but likewise against a custom that had obtained amongst the *Jews* of Swearing, by the Heavens, the Earth, *Jerusalem*, &c. as likewise that Swearing was used * before the Law, and † under the Law, and under the Gospel, || S. *Paul* swearing often, our blessed Saviour not † refusing to answer upon Adjuration, God himself || being represented as swearing, and * *an Oath for confirmation being* recommended as *the end of all Strife*, none can doubt whether this Prohibition be to be understood with restriction. But what affinity is there betwixt these words of our Lord, and those of the Apostle in the Text? Was resistance to Princes allowed of before and under the Law? Has God, our Blessed Saviour, or any of his Apostles, set an Example of it? Or is it any where recommended in Scripture? Sure Mr. *H.* had not considered at all, when he alledged these words as an Evidence of the lawfulness of Resistance.

---

† *S.* Matt. 5. 34. || Ver. 34, 35, 36.

* Gen. 21. 23, 24. and 24. 3, 4. and 31. 53. and again 47. 29, 30, 31.

† Josh. 9. 19. Judg. 21. 1, 7. 1 Sam. 20. 41. Psal. 119. 106. Deut. 6. 13. and 10. 20. Jer. 4. 2. and divers other places.

|| Rom. 1. 9. and 9. 1. 2 Cor 1. 23. and 11. 31. Gal. 1. 20. Phil. 1. 8. and other places.

† *S.* Matt. 26. 63. || Heb. 6. 13. ‡ Ver. 16.

3. His

3. His Third Instance is in that Advice of S. *Paul* to *Titus*, † to *speak evil of no man*. Concerning which I need not tell Mr. *H.* that in the Original it is μηδένα βλασφημεῖν, *to slander and defame no man*, || to blast no one's Reputation by an unjust charge upon him. And therefore I conclude, that if he consider this, he will not see any reason why these words may not be understood in their strict literal Sense. In short, this is the only true Parallel to his Text of all he has produced, because of them all these words, like that, undoubtedly need no restriction.

4. * *Pray without ceasing* is another of his Instances. Ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε. I believe Mr *H.* will not be able to prove that these words import any more than those of our Lord, S. *Luke* 18. 1. that Men ought to *pray always*, or persevere in this Duty, and *not to faint*, or be discouraged, though they have not their Petitions immediately granted them; μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, not to be weary of it, or backward to it. So the Word is used, 2 *Thes.* 3. 13. And so says † *Budæus*; or not to be tired and give over, so || *Hesychius*; or than those of the Apostle, *Rom.* 12. 12. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες, *continuing instant in Prayer.* And so this Text will need no restriction. Or if he can make it out, that the Words literally import an incessant attendance upon this Duty, I grant they must then be understood with restriction, not only because it is not lawful to pray always to the hindrance of other Duties, which interfere with such a constant attendance upon this, and yet are of such necessity as not to be omitted for the sake of it; but moreover because it is not possible to be continually engaged in this Duty, to the neglect of our necessary food, and other natural occasions, and the depriving us of our Sleep,

† Tit. 3. 2.

|| So the Etymology of the word imports, ἀπὸ τοῦ βλάπτειν τὴν φήμην.

* 1 Thes. 5. 17.

† Μὴ ἐκκάμοιεν, ne elaffescant, ut *Plinius* dixit. Quod apud Apostolum ἐκκακεῖν legitur Ephes. 3. 10. μὴ ἐκκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι.

|| ἐκκακῶμεν, ἠμελῶμεν, ἠκηδιῶμεν.

without

without which we can no more subsist, than without our daily Food. And when Mr. *H.* can evince it alike unlawful and impossible to forbear Resisting the *Higher Powers*, I will own the case alike in both. Till then, I hope he will be more ingenuous than to insist upon it.

5. A farther Instance to this purpose is in those words of the Apostle, * *Rejoyce evermore.* But Mr. *H.* knows very well, that the Scripture not only directs to *rejoyce evermore*, but to † *lament and weep, and mourn*; and that for this reason it is necessary so to interpret both these Precepts, as that they may consist with each other. But the same Scripture as I have already observed, has no where enjoined Subjects to resist their Sovereign, whereby to restrain this Command in the Text, *to be Subject to the Higher Powers.*

6. His next Instance is, || *Give to every one that asketh.* And to this I must answer, that when Mr. *H.* can shew this command as possible to be performed in its utmost extent, as it is to forbear all Resistance of our Superiors, I shall concur with him that his Text ought to be restrained as much as this; but it will be unreasonable to expect it till then.

7. There is but one Instance more to be considered, and that is * of our Saviour's forbidding to revenge our selves upon *Private Injurious Persons. In which case* saith he, *our Saviour himself hath laid down* Non-resistance *in more express and more absolute words, than either He, or any of his* Apostles *did with respect to Princes.* For answer whereto, the Reader may please to remember, it is *Grotius*'s observation upon the place, that *to*

---

* 1 Thes. 5. 16.
† *S.* Jam. 4. 9.
|| *S.* Matt. 5. 42.
* *S.* Matt. 5. 39.

turn the cheek to the smiter, was a Proverbial saying amongst the *Jews*, and meant no more than *patiently to bear an affront or injury*, and this we all know is our Saviour's Doctrine, and to be practised by such as hope to be saved by him. But yet

1. I deny that *our Saviour has laid down* Non-resistance *in this Case* more expressly than Resistance of Princes is forbidden both by Himself and his Apostles.

2. I observe that the Instances our Saviour mentions, when he forbids to resist Evil, are such as a Man may comply with without any great damage; such are turning one Cheek when the other is smitten, and parting with a Cloak or a Coat; in which I see no such Absurdity, as that the Injunction may not be literally complied with.

3. In Assaults and Injuries of a higher Nature and greater Consequence, not only the Apostle allows to * *go to Law*, provided it be *before the Saints*, before whom, for the honour of Christianity, he would have it, rather than before the Heathen Tribunals, but our Lord himself intimates a Defence of our Lives and Livelyhoods to be allowed to his Disciples. For I cannot apprehend to what other end he should advise, that *he who had no Sword*, † *should sell his garment and buy one*; nor what could be meant by that other saying of our Lord, ‖ that *the Master of the Family would not have suffered his house to be broken through*. Let Mr. *H.* shew any such allowance for Resisting the *Higher Powers*, before he pretends this case to resemble that before us.

---

* 1 Cor. 6 1, 2.
† S. Luke 22. 36.
‖ S. Luke 12. 39

4. If Mr. *H.* ſhould urge farther that our Saviour ſpeaks of the loſs not only of a Garment, but of an Eye or a Tooth, and the loſs of theſe, eſpecially of the former of them is of greater Conſequence, and ſo might call for a Reparation; to this I anſwer, that the loſs of an Eye is great, but will not be one jot the leſs by a Retaliation in the ſame kind. And no wonder therefore if our Bleſſed Saviour has totally forbidden all proceedings of that nature, as not ſuiting with the kind and meek, patient and peaceable Spirit and Temper of the Goſpel. But what is this to Mr. *H*'s. Doctrine of Reſiſtance? Or what can he infer from hence to authorize the taking up of Arms againſt the Magiſtrate?

But more particularly,

1. *Non-reſiſtance*, ſays Mr. *H. in the caſe of Private* Perſons, *is more abſolutely laid down in the New* Teſtament, *than in the caſe of Princes.* But I cannot find in what place of Scripture it is ſo.

2. He ſays, *it is as much the Doctrine of the Croſs as the other.* Whereſoever it is ſo, no doubt it ought to be practiſed as much as the other. But where the Scripture allows a remedy in this caſe, and not in the other, it is not, nor can be equally the Doctrine of the Croſs.

3. *It is as Glorious and as becoming the Peaceable Temper of Chriſtianity*, as the other. But the preſent queſtion is, whether it be in all caſes as neceſſary as the other?

4. *The Injurious Perſon is as much ſent by the Providence of God for your Puniſhment, as the Injurious* Prince *is placed upon the* Throne *for that purpoſe.* See how this agrees with *Hoſea* 13. 11. *I gave thee a King in mine Anger.*

Anger, meaning an Evil one, says our * *Homily against Wilful Rebellion*; and with *Isaiah* 10. 5. Where *Sennacherib* is called *the Rod of God's Anger*. After which Divine Declaration, † it is too much to say that such injurious Kings are no more set up by God's Providence, or sent for the Punishment of a wicked People, than ‖ a Highway-Man, or House-breaker, a Robber or a Cut-throat, or other like *Injurious Person*, is for the Punishment of Private Persons. Here is no more than a bare Permissive Providence; but if there were not more in the former case, it would be impossible to explain how the *Powers that be are ordained of God*.

Lastly, Says Mr. *H. It is not of so ill Consequence to recede from your own Right, and Liberty, and to let your self be ruined, as it is to give up the Rights and Liberties of your self, and Neighbours, and your whole Posterity.* The tendency of which Assertion is only to prove that Publick Submission is more highly prejudicial than bearing Private Injuries, not that *Non-resistance in the case of Private Persons, is more absolutely laid down in the New Testament than in the case of Princes.* And besides, it is built upon two Suppositions, both of them at best very doubtful and uncertain, and therefore by no means to be depended upon. For,

1. It supposes that not to resist a Tyrannical Prince, is *to give up our Rights and Liberties, and of our Neighbours, and our whole Posterity*; whereas when done in Obedience to God's Command, and because it cannot be avoided without Sin, to submit in this case, as I have noted before, is only to commit our selves to his Care and good Providence, which is the best Pro-

* Part 1st. Page 280.

† *See Arch-Bishop* Usher's *Power of the Prince*, Page 169, 170.

‖ Page 89, and 149.

tection we can hope for; in as much as he knows how to over-rule all Events to his own purposes, and has moreover passed his word, that he will make all *things*, and if all things, then our greatest Sufferings and Afflictions, to * *work together for the good of them that love God.*

2. It supposes Resistance an effectual means of securing our selves, our Neighbours, and our Posterity, against the Invasions of Tyrannical Governors. Whereas there is no just reason to expect this Event, but rather to fear that all our Attempts of this Nature, because unlawful, should have a contrary Effect, and conduce rather to our Slavery and Ruine; as it did here from the beginning of the long Rebellion, till the happy Restauration of King *Charles* II. and as it did likewise with the *Bohemians*, whom, when the Cruelties and Oppressions they laboured under, had provoked to Arms, they soon felt the dismal effect of them; *for* † *being subdued, the chief of their Nobility were some punished, and others put to flight, their Pastors were proscribed, and their People assaulted, some by Flatteries, and others by Terrors and ill Usage, to make them change their Religion; and in a little time their Nobles were all banished, and the Common People committed to Prisons and Tortures; till at length, they had not a Church left standing, nor a School, nor were allowed so much as the private Exercise of their Religion, or the use of their Bibles, or Books of Devotion.*

Thus I have gone through all Mr. *H's.* Scripture-Instances, for the Restriction of this Precept of the Apostle. And by this time I hope it fully appears that none of them come up to his purpose; but that this

---

* Rom. 8. 28.

† Eccles. Sclavon. Histor. a Jo. Am. Commen. Edit. P. 58, 59.

Com-

Command to *be subject to the Higher Powers* remains yet as extensive and unrestrained, as if not one of them had ever been mentioned.

Yet after all, he is pleased to tell us, * *as far as he can see, there is not one Reason, which can be brought against* Resistance *to* Publick Injuries, *but what holds more strongly against* Resistance *to* Private Injuries: *But that many Reasons may be brought against* Resistance *to* Private Injuries, *which cannot hold in the other.*

I have told him of one Reason against *Publick Resistance*, the great Mischief that usually redounds thence to the Society; and I find I must again put him in mind of another and a greater, that it is a resisting *the Ordinance of God*, and a ready way to *Damnation*, which he cannot say of all Resistance upon Personal Injuries. He cannot say Resisting a Private Person is Resisting the *Ordinance of God*. And as little that any allowable course of Resisting such, is attended with the like dismal Consequence. The natural Result of which considerations is, that there is no compare between these two Cases, of Publick and Private Resistance; and all the Allowance which is made for the latter, does not at all plead a like liberty as to the Former.

4. A Fourth Argument produced by Mr. *H.* for restraining this Precept of the Apostle, is as little to the purpose as any thing he has yet said; and has been so fully answered already, that I need only to remind him of what he ought to have considered, had I not called upon him to do it before; as I have more than once: namely that God is to be obeyed rather than Man. † His Observation is, that *they who blame all* Re-

* Page 59.

† Page 59.

ſtrictions *and* Limitations *to this Place, when applied to the* Non-reſiſtance *and* Paſſive Obedience *here taught, are forced themſelves to apply* Limitations *to this very place of Scripture, with reſpect to the* Active Obedience *here taught.* And || reaſon good; for let me ask with *S. Peter* and *S. John,* * *Whether it be right in the ſight of God, to hearken unto you* [the Rulers and Magiſtrates] *more than unto God, judge ye.* And let me withal deſire Mr. *H.* to produce a like Authority for reſtraining the *Paſſive Obedience* required in his Text; or to forbear inferring from the Reſtriction of our Active Obedience, that That muſt be Reſtrained too, till he has done it; and then we ſhall have no more of theſe Pretences.

Mr. *H. deſires it may* farther *be conſidered, that this Paſſage of S.* Paul *relating as well to the* Inferiour, *as the* Superiour *Degree of* Magiſtrates, *if it follow from this Place that* Reſiſtance *in any Caſe to the* Supreme Magiſtrate *is a damnable Sin, it will alſo follow that* Reſiſtance *in any Caſe to the loweſt* Magiſtrate *is a Damnable Sin.* Mr. *H.* does well here to take it for granted, that theſe words relate as well to *Inferiour* as *Supream Magiſtrates,* becauſe he can never prove it. † The *Inferiour* cannot be the *Superiour,* nor the *Loweſt Ma-*

|| The Apoſtle ſays, *they that reſiſt ſhall receive to themſelves damnation*; not they that do not obey. Doubtleſs therefore there is a difference. I have always thought Paſſive Obedience to be a *Medium* or *Chriſtian Vertue between them*; and ſurely ſo it is, unleſs Rebellion of late hath tane it from its place, made a vice of it, and clapt it into Priſon. *Symmons's Loyal Subjects belief.* Section 9. Page 25.

* Act. 4. 19.

† Summa autem [n. poteſtas civilis] illa dicitur, cujus actus alterius juri non ſubſunt, ita ut alterius voluntatis humanæ arbitrio irriti poſſint reddi. *Grot. de jur.* B. ac P. l. 1. c. 3. Sect. 7.

giſtrate

giſtrate the *Higher*, or *Higheſt Powers*, any more than a Petty Conſtable is a King or Emperor. And yet it is only of the *Higheſt Powers* upon the place, the ὑπερέχουσαι ἐξουσίαι,|| that the Apoſtle ſpeaks in this Place. So that this Relation of the Words to the *Loweſt Magiſtrate* is none of the Apoſtle's Doctrine, but Mr. *H*s. own Imagination.

Mr *H.* obſerves farther in relation to S. *Paul*'s behaviour towards *the Magiſtrates of* Philippi, *Act.* 16. 37. *that if he had had Power enough, he would not have endured their Injuries.* And I confeſs I am of the ſame mind; but then I ſee no reaſon to imagine with Mr. *H.* that he would have taken up Arms againſt them, but only that by Appealing to ſome higher Court he would have got them puniſhed for their irregular Proceedings againſt himſelf and *Silas*, his fellow-Priſoner. This I am ſatisfied is the utmoſt Mr. *H.* can infer from this Obſervation; and if he can make any uſe of it for patronizing the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, he may improve it to the beſt advantage he ſhall be able.

Another of his *Obſervations is*, * *that if S.* Paul *had intended, or plainly laid down ſuch an Abſolute Subjection, and* Non-reſiſtance *to* Governors, *as ſome have built upon the* 13*th Chapter of his* Epiſtle *to the* Romans, *and this before he was accuſed as a* Peſtilent Fellow, *and a* mover of Sedition, *Act.* 24. 5. *he could not poſſibly have done more for his own Defence than to have appealed to that* Chapter, *and Pleaded that he was an Enemy to* Sedition, *&c.* This is the Objection; but Mr. *H.* has been ſo kind as to ſave me the trouble of a Reply to

|| The ſame word that is rendered *Supreme*, 1 S. *Pet.* 2. 13.

* Page 62.

it, for himself sufficiently answers it towards the bottom of the Page, by acquainting us with the tenor of his Accusation, which was that *he endeavoured to draw* his Hearers *off from the Observation of the Ceremonial Law, and that this was all the* Sedition *or* Disturbance *intended in this Accusation.* Which being so, I see not what reason the Apostle had to appeal to these words of his Epistle to the *Romans*; his proper business being to justifie what he had taught amongst the *Jews* his Accusers, not to go off to another Argument, which how true soever, had yet no relation to the Point they were then upon.

He adds another Observation *by the way*, which he might every whit as well have let alone, for any service it will do Him, or his Cause; however I must take notice of it, that he may not complain of a neglect. And it is this, *He seems by his Appealing to* Rome *for Judgment in his Case, to have been pretty well satisfied that the Course of* Publick Justice *was not yet so interrupted and disturbed, but that he might yet have all the Right allowed him that a* Roman *could claim.* The natural Consequence of which is, that how bad soever *Nero* were in himself, yet so long as he had those under him who took care to see Justice administered, so that an Appellant might have all the Right done him that he could desire, there was no just ground for taking up Arms against him, even upon Mr *H*'s. own Principle. And if *Nero* were not to be resisted, very few other Princes can have deserved it.

One thing † more Mr. *H.* observes, that *what S.* Paul *has delivered in this* Chapter, *concerning the Duty of* Subjects, *is not barely by way of* Precept,

† Page 92.

or Command *only, as He hath done in many other Cases, but by way of Reasoning, or inferring one thing from another.* So say I too. He adds that this *will help mightily to secure the true Sense of the Place.* In which I concur with him likewise. *So that,* says he, *in order to prove that I have mistaken or misrepresented S.* Paul, *it will not be sufficient to say, that he condemns* Resistance, and *presseth* Subjection; *for so,* says Mr *H. do I*; and so he certainly does, if pleading for Resistance with all his might, be to *condemn Resistance, and to press Subjection.* But *it must be shewn,* as he proceeds, *that his Reasoning concludes against the* Resistance *which I have taught to be lawful.* So that here by his own confession, *condemning* Resistance, *is teaching it to be lawful:* But this, as I have observed, is Mr *H's.* way of condemning. Yet this is not all; for it must be farther shewn, that the Apostle *necessarily inferrs such a* Passive Submission, *as Mr* H. *has denied to follow from it*; and that this Passage *can admit of no* Restrictions, *though numberless other Passages of the* New Testament *necessarily require them.* Both which Points I hope I have fully cleared to the Satisfaction of the honest and impartial Reader. For I have proved that the Apostle does infer from the Magistrate's being *God's Ordinance, &c.* such a Submissive Passive Obedience as Mr. *H.* has been zealously labouring to extirpate; and that not only *this Passage does admit of no Restriction,* but all the other Places he has cited out of the New Testament for restraining it, leave it yet as free and unrestrained as it was before.

Thus I have gone through the first Part of my Undertaking, which was *to shew that Mr* H. *has not proved the truth of his Doctrine of Resistance:* And from what I have written it is easie to observe, that he has neither given us a true account of the Apostle's Doctrine in his Text, nor really established

the

the lawfulneſs of Reſiſting the higher Powers in any caſe, nor ſo much as laid down a true Criterion whereby even according to his own Doctrine Subjects might know when it is lawful for them to fly to Arms, or what ſteps muſt neceſſarily have been taken by their Superiours, before they might warrantably apply themſelves to this method for redreſs of their Grievances, if his Doctrine had been true; Beſides that he bids defiance to the Parliament, no leſs than the Queen, by teaching both from the * Pulpit, and from the † Preſs, that *ſhould all who are poſſeſſed of Power, in any Form of Government, conſent, and agree, to inſlave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and to make them Miſerable,* || *there is nothing in Nature, or in the Chriſtian Religion, that can hinder the People from redreſſing their Grievances, and from anſwering the Will of Almighty God, ſo far as to preſerve, and ſecure the Happineſs of the Publick Society.*

The natural Conſequence of which Doctrine is, that if the Bill againſt *Occaſional Conformity* had formerly gone on as was intended, which one Part

---

* Page 10.

† Page 38.

|| So alſo in the Preface to his *Original and Inſtitution of Civil Government Diſcuſſed*, p. xi. Is not *Univerſal Miſery* and *Ruine*, the ſame, whether it comes from the hands of *Many*, or of One? Would not the *Unhappineſs* of this *Nation*, in particular, have been the ſame, whether a *Late King* alone, or by the help of a *formal Law*, had ſubjected it to the *Religion* of *Rome*, and the *Maxims* of *France*? &c.

of

of the Nation would have been ſure to complain of as a Hardſhip upon them; or at preſent if the Party now laid aſide ſhould diſlike the Proceedings of the next Parliament, and ſhould conclude them to tend to the Prejudice and Damage of the People, and a likely means of making them miſerable, they are at Liberty to raiſe a Commotion in the Nation, and try if they can by Force regain their former Places of Honour, and Advantage, and Power, in order to their own and the Nation's Safety. And ſo here is a delicate Scheme laid for Rebellion, whenſoever an Opportunity ſhall offer it ſelf. Eſpecially ſince ſuch as may be inclined to it will preſently conſtrue him to recommend it, as a noble, a glorious and honourable Undertaking, to free themſelves and their Adherents from the Loſſes, the Neglect, and other Inconveniencies, they might otherwiſe come to labour under, and perhaps their Poſterity in ſucceeding Generations.

This too many will eaſily perſwade themſelves to have been his meaning, in telling them * that *Suppoſing it true, that* Governors *act contrary to the End of their Inſtitution, invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society, over which they are placed: it is Lawful and Glorious for theſe* Subjects *to conſult the Happineſs of the* Publick, *and of their Poſterity after them, by oppoſing and reſiſting ſuch* Governours.

Mr. *H.* proceeds at large to anſwer divers Objections againſt his Doctrine; moſt of which I ſhall entirely paſs over, as not pertinent to my preſent purpoſe. But before he does this, he profeſſes † *to*

* Page 40.

† Page 65.

ſet

ſet down the Doctrine *he has taught, and then the* Doctrin *contrary to it*, whereby to ſet off his own to the better Advantage. Both theſe I ſhall ſubjoin here, and then ſhall conclude this Firſt Part, with a Third, which I promiſe my ſelf the Reader will find to be a truer and by much a juſter ſtate of the Caſe than either of them.

His own Doctrine, he tells us, *may be compriſed* in this *one following Propoſition, in the words juſt now mentioned; Suppoſing it true, that Governours act contrary to the End of their Inſtitution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for theſe Subjects to conſult the Happineſs of the Publick, and of their Poſterity after them, by Oppoſing and Reſiſting ſuch Governours.*

This is Mr. *H*'s. Doctrine, in his own Words; and if this be falſe, the contrary, as he juſtly obſerves muſt be true. This he undertakes to ſet down therefore in the following Words; *Suppoſing it true, that Governours act contrary to the end of their Inſtitution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruine of that Society over which they are placed; it is not Lawful for theſe* Subjects *to conſult the Happineſs of the* Publick, *and of their Poſterity, by oppoſing and reſiſting ſuch Governours. But it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, to ſuffer patiently all their Oppreſſions, and to let the Happineſs of Humane Society be entirely Ruined at their Will and Pleaſure.*

In both theſe Propoſitions Mr. *H.* entirely ſets aſide not only the Doctrine of his Text, but the good Providence of God, and the gracious Promiſes of Protection he has made to thoſe that *caſt their care upon him*, and ſuffer patiently and chriſtianly for his ſake. Nor is there a Word in either of them that in the leaſt

leaſt ſavours of Chriſtianity, or might not have much better become a profeſſed Heathen, than a Diſciple of our Bleſſed Lord and Saviour; or a meer Politician, than a Preacher of the Goſpel.

Therefore if he pleaſe to give me leave, I will offer at another Propoſition, which perhaps may ſet the Queſtion we are upon in a better light; but which I am ſure ſuits much better with the Precepts of the Goſpel, and that Dependance we all ought to have upon Almighty God, in our greateſt Exigences, and when under our moſt diſmal Fears or Sufferings.

It is this; *Suppoſing it true, that Governours act contrary to the End of their Inſtitution*, and in all reſpects as ill as Mr. *H.* ſuppoſes; as it is not ſafe *for their Subjects to conſult the Happineſs of the Publick, and of their Poſterity, by oppoſing and reſiſting ſuch Governours*, leaſt they thereby provoke Almighty God to bring upon them a much ſorer Deſtruction than what they thus endeavour to ſtave off; *So on the other hand it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, patiently to ſuffer all their Oppreſſions*, as the Primitive Martyrs and Confeſſors did, as Chriſtian Subjects, and Diſciples of Chriſt, wholly referring their Cauſe, and reſigning themſelves to God's good Pleaſure; either to be delivered in his due time, or if he ſhall have otherwiſe determined concerning them, reſolutely and chearfully, faithfully and ſubmiſſively, to bear what ever he ſhall, in his infinite Wiſdom, ſee fit to lay upon them, in a firm and full aſſurance of an Abundant Recompence in a future State, when their *light Afflictions, and which were* comparatively *but for a moment, ſhall have wrought out for them a far more exceeding and eternal weight of Glory.*

The

The ſumm of all is, that it is much ſafer and better, more laudable and glorious, more dutiful and Chriſtian, to rely wholly upon that Good Providence, which Mr. *H.* has left entirely out of the Controverſie, than upon the Reſiſtance he is ſo zealous an Advocate for.

The End of the Firſt Part.

BOOKS Sold by W. Taylor, *at the* Ship *in* Pater-noſter-Row.

SERMONS on ſeveral Subjects, *&c.*

Vol. VIII. Holineſs the Great Deſign of the Goſpel Diſpenſation.

Chriſt's Life a Pattern of Holineſs to Chriſtians.

The Holineſs of Chriſtians ought to be Eminent.

The Holineſs of Chriſtians ought to be Conſpicuous.

The Wiſdom of being Holy.

The Advantage of being Holy.

The Pleaſure of being Holy.

The Exemplary Holineſs of the Primitive Chriſtians.

Chriſt's Grace ſufficient to make Chriſtians Holy.

Vol. IX. The Nature, Extent, and Polity of God's Kingdom on Earth.

God's Omnipreſence the beſt Guard againſt Sin.

Perpetual Rejoycing the Duty of Chriſtians.

All things to be done to the Glory of God.

All things to be done in the Name of Chriſt.

The Meditation of God's Love the Good Man's Delight.

The Vanity of Hearing the Word of God without Doing it.

The Duty and Advantage of ſeeking Spiritual Things.

The Sinfulneſs and Miſchief of Worldly Anxiety.

The Great Duty and Happineſs of Loving God, *&c.*

Vol. X. The Eaſineſs of Chriſt's Yoke.

The Chriſtian Race.

Chriſt the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

Chriſt a Saviour before his Incarnation.

The Preſence of Chriſt in the Religious Aſſemblies of Chriſtians.

The

The Way of seeking God so as to find him.
The Way of pleasing God.
The Parable of the Sower.
The Blessing of Purity in Heart.
Against Rash Swearing.
A *Spittal* Sermon, on 1 *Tim.* 6. 17.
Obedience to Governours.

All three by the Right Reverend Father in God, *Will. Beveridge*, D. D. late Lord Bishop of St. *Asaph*. Printed from his Original Manuscripts.

Demonstratio de Deo; sive Methodus ad Cognitionem Dei Naturalem, brevis ac demonstrativa. Cui accedunt Epistolæ quædam miscellaneæ; de Animæ Natura & Immortalitate, de Veritate Religionis Christianæ, de Universo, &c. Authore Josepho Raphson, A. M. & Reg. Soc. Socio.

An University Oration concerning the different Fates of the Christian Religion, spoken in the Publick Act of the University of *Geneva* the 11th Day of *May*, 1708. In which the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy is asserted, Separation on the account of Ceremony is condemn'd, and an universal Conformity of the Protestant Churches to the ancient Discipline and Worship is wish'd for. By *John Alphonsus Turretin*, Pastor, Professor of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History, and Deputy Rector of the University. The Second Edition. To which is added, Dr. *Nicholls*'s Thanks to Mr. *Turretin*; Written by Order of the Society for Propagation of Religion, for his Oration of the different Fates, dedicated to them.

A Bridle for the Tongue, under these following Heads; *viz.* Of prophane Atheistical Discourse, of Blasphemy, of rash and vain Swearing, of False-accusing, or bearing False-witness, of Calumny or Slander, of Detraction, or Backbiting, and of Tale-bearing and Reproof, of Censoriousness, or rash Judging, of Scoffing, Derision or Mocking, of Contumely or Reproach, of Imprecation or Cursing, of Brawling, Quarrelling, or Wrangling, of Dissimulation or Deceit, of Flattery, of Lying, Equivocation, Promise-breaking, and Discovering Secrets, of Talkativeness, Garrulity, or vain Babling, of Ostentation, or Boasting, of Querelousness or Murmuring, of foolish Jesting, of obscene and immodest Talk. By *Henry Hooton*, M. A.

Mr. *HOADLY's* MEASURES of SUBMISSION TO THE Civil Magistrate Enquired into, and Disproved.

PART. II.

Wherein is shewn,

That the RESISTANCE Mr. *HOADLY* has taught is contrary to Scripture, and to the Doctrines and Practices of the Primitive Christians, to the Doctrine of our own Church, and the Laws of the Land; and moreover that it is not so necessary in order to the Welfare of Mankind, as he seems to imagine.

By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

When I consider how expressly Christ forbids his Disciples to resist Evil, *Matt.* 5. 39. *how severely that Resistance is condemned by S.* Paul, *and that* Condemnation *is declared the Punishment of it, I am forced to cry out, Oh! what Times have we fallen in, in which Men dare, against the express Laws of the Gospel, defend that Practice upon which God hath passed this Condemnation?* If whosoever break the least of these commandments, and teach men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of God; *what shall their Portion be, who teach Men to break one* of the greatest of these Commandments, *such as are the Laws of Peace and Subjection? And what may we not look for from such Teachers, who dare tax that glorious Doctrine of patient Suffering, as brutish and irrational; and though it be expressly said,* 1 *S.* Pet. 2. 21. That Christ by suffering for us, left us an example, how to follow his steps? *Vindication of the Church and State of* Scotland, *By* GILBERT BURNET, Professor of Theology in Glasgow, *now the Lord Bishop of* SARUM; p. 17, 18.

LONDON: Printed for *W. Freeman* at the *Bible* near *Chancery Lane*, *Fleetstreet*, and *R. Wilkin* at the *King's-Head* in St. *Paul's Churchyard*, 1712.

THE
PREFACE.

MR. *HOADLY* in the beginning of his third Chapter professes, to set down the Doctrine he had taught, and the Doctrine contrary to it, that so the Reader might the better judge of both, and might the more easily see, on which side the Truth lies. His own Doctrine he comprises in this Proposition, *Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society, over which they are placed; it is Lawful and Glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.* This he delivers as the Substance and Epitome of his own Doctrine. And to support it he argues, That *if this Proposition be false, the contrary must be true.* Which therefore he sets down thus:

Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society, over which they are placed; it is not Lawful for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governors. But it is their Duty, and Glorious for them, to suffer patiently all their Oppressions, and let the Happiness of Human Society be entirely ruined at their Will and Pleasure. And this latter Proposition he thinks should seem so absurd to all Persons of Understanding, *as to be rejected, if any thing ought to be so, without farther Examination.* Hence in the Conclusion of the former part of this Discourse, I thought it proper to give the Reader another view of this Controversy, by setting it in a truer Light, and which far better deserves the Attention of a Christian, whose *Conversation* ought to be continually in *Heaven*, and whom our Blessed Saviour teaches *to seek first the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness*, as of infinitely more important Concern to him, than all the greatest Temporal Safety and Welfare, and who ought to be mindful, that had Resistance been the best means of promoting our present Happiness, which is more than Mr. *Hoadly* will ever be able to prove, yet were this by no means to be set in competition with the Rewards or

Punish-

Punishments of the other World. Thus therefore say I,

Supposing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Institution, and in all respects as ill as Mr. *Hoadly* supposes; *as it is not safe for their* Subjects *to oppose and resist such Governors*, lest they thereby provoke Almighty God to bring upon them a far heavier Destruction, than what they thus endeavour to stave off; so on the other hand it is their Duty, *and Glorious for them, patiently to suffer all their Oppressions*, as the Primitive Martyrs and Confessors did, and as Christian Subjects, and the Disciples of Christ ought to do, wholly referring their Cause and resigning themselves to God's good Pleasure, either to be delivered in his due time, or if he shall have otherwise determined concerning them, resolutely and chearfully, faithfully and submissively to bear, whatever He shall in his infinite Wisdom see fit to lay upon them; in a firm and full Assurance of an abundant Recompence in a future State, when their *light Afflictions*, which were comparatively *but for a Moment*, shall have wrought out for them *a far more exceeding and eternal Weight of Glory*. And now that I may proceed in Mr. *H.*'s own method, I add, *If this Proposition be false, the contrary must be true*; which therefore I shall here set down.

make all good Christians exceedingly more desirous *to lay up to themselves Treasures in Heaven*, though with the loss of all they had esteemed most highly here, and even of their Lives if called to it, than forfeit their eternal Welfare for the sake of the utmost Happiness this World can possibly afford.

So that every one must needs see, that it would have been much more becoming Mr. *H.*'s Character, who himself owns (*a*) *that he was to act the part of a Divine*, to have really done so, to call upon People to look forward to another State, and make it their chief care to provide for that, than to put them upon consulting their temporal Safety, if Resistance can in any sense be said to be a consulting that, in direct defiance to his Text, and the Doctrine of that Religion whereof he is a Preacher. And barely thus changing the State of the Question, and putting it upon its true foot, shews plainly that Mr. *H.*'s way of arguing is dangerous, and consists rather in an artful turn of Words, than any true and solid Reasoning. Inasmuch as do but once apply the Case of Resistance to the Doctrine of the Gospel and the Hopes of another Life, and the Fear of that heavy *Damnation* the Apostle has annext to it, and it has immediately a very different Face, from what it had, when applied only to the

(*a*) Measures of Submission. *p.* 112.

the preſent Safety and Happineſs of ourſelves, and the Community whereto we appertain.

I am perſuaded any impartial Perſon may eaſily be ſatisfied, by what has been ſaid in the former part of this Diſcourſe, of the Unlawfulneſs of the *Reſiſtance Mr.* H. *has taught.* But yet to make it more plain and evident, I have undertaken a farther Conſideration of it, to ſhew its Inconſiſtency with either Chriſtianity, or the Laws of the Land; which I confeſs has ſwelled to ſomewhat a larger Bulk than I intended, but yet I hope is not larger than the Argument I am treating of required. And if the Reader find it to his ſatisfaction, and that I have really performed what I undertook, I ſhall not be ſorry that I have been at more Pains to ſerve him, than I had at firſt propoſed to myſelf.

All I have farther to add, is only to entreat the Reader's Pardon that this ſecond Part has not ſooner followed the other, as it ought to have done; and as it ſhould have done, being ready for the Preſs before the laſt Term, but that it could not be got printed time enough to be publiſhed then.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

THE Introduction. p. 1. *The Design of the Whole.* p. 2.

CHAP. I.

Whether Mr. H.*'s Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to Scripture?* p. 3. *The Testimony of Scripture is against it.* ibid. *The Titles given to Sovereign Princes therein.* p. 4. *Prohibitions of Resistance in the Old Testament.* ibid. *And in the New.* p. 7. *Mr.* H.*'s Exceptions to these considered.* p. 11.

CHAP. II.

Whether Mr. H.*'s Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians?* p. 37.

SECT. I. *What the Doctrine of the Primitive Christians was, as to the Duty of Obedience to Governors.* p. 39. *This shewn from the Constitutions called Apostolical.* p. 40. *From S.* Ignatius. p. 41. *From* Justin M. ibid. *From* Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, *and S.* Polycarp. p. 42. *From S.* Irenæus. p. 43. *From* Tertullian. p. 44. *From* Origen. p. 46. *From S.* Cyprian. p. 47. *From* Marinus, *and* Theotecnus. p. 50. *From* Dionysius *of* Alexandria. p. 51.

From

From Lactantius, *and* Gregory Nazianzen. p. 52. *From S.* Ambrose. p. 53. *From* Gregory Nyssen. p. 54. *From S.* Jerome, *and* Optatus. p. 55. *From S.* Augustin. p. 56. *From S.* Chrysostom. p. 57.

SECT. II. *What the Practice of the Primitive Christians was, in the point of Obedience to Governors.* p. 62. *They prayed for their present Governors.* p. 63. *They readily submitted to the hardest Usage they met with from them.* p. 66. *And tho' it were against Law.* p. 71. *As was usual in many Cases.* p. 74. *They bare their many Hardships with a wonderful Calmness and Submission.* p. 93. *And this when well able to have defended themselves.* p. 100. *And when they did not want such as would have headed them in an Insurrection.* p. 108.

SECT. III. *What Obligation we are all under, to the Imitation of these devout and heavenly-minded Christians.* p. 112. *In what Sense they understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the Case of Resistance.* p. 113. *What indispensable Obligation they thought themselves under to behave themselves accordingly.* p. 116. *How we are all bound to follow their Example herein.* p. 119.

SECT. IV. *What Mr.* H. *has offered in answer to this Argument considered.* p. 125.

CHAP. III.

What the Doctrine of our own Church is, in relation to this Principle of Non-resistance. p. 172. *This shewn from the Doctrines of several of our Bishops, and other Divines.* p. 173. *And from the Doctrine of the Homilies.* p. 188. *Mr.* H.*'s Replies considered.* p. 201.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Whether Mr. H.*'s Doctrine be consistent with our own Municipal Laws?* p. 211. *No countenance given to it by these Laws.* p. 212. *But on the contrary, They declare the Supremacy to be solely in the King.* p. 214. *That all Allegiance is due to Him alone.* p. 222. *That he has the sole Power of the Militia.* p. 223. *That all Resistance of him is High Treason.* p. 230. *And condemn all Coercion of him.* p. 231. *And all Conspiring or Imagining his Death.* p. 233. *Mr.*H.*'s Pretences to the contrary answered.* p. 234.

CHAP. V.

Whether a patient Submission and Non-resistance be not preferable to Resistance upon divers Accounts? p. 245. *It is more pleasing to Almighty God.* p. 246. *It is more becoming our holy Profession.* p. 247. *It is a likelier method of preserving and propagating our Religion.* p. 252. *It is a surer course for obtaining eternal Happiness hereafter.* p. 258. *And is not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the generality of the World are apt to imagine.* p. 259.
The Conclusion of the Whole. p. 263.
The LETTER *concerning the Homilies.*

Mr.

Mr. Hoadly's

MEASURES of SUBMISSION TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE

Enquired into, and Diſproved.

PART. II.

The Introduction.

THOUGH it were anſwer enough to Mr. *Hoadly*, to have ſhewn the Weakneſs of his Arguments, and that after all the Applauſe his celebrated Performance has met with, upon a little Examination, it appears to fall very ſhort, of proving the Lawfulneſs of that RESISTANCE it is ſo celebrated for; yet the more effectually to eſtabliſh that truly Chriſtian Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance*, which he has ſo induſtriouſly ſet himſelf to overthrow, I propounded in the ſecond place, and accordingly now proceed, *To evince the Groundleſneſs and Falſity of his Doctrine*, and that as he has not yet been able to Prove it, ſo neither is it in itſelf capable of Proof.

This must necessarily be acknowledged to be true, supposing he has neither Scripture, Reason, nor Antiquity of his side. But if not only these do not bear testimony to his Doctrine, but are directly opposite to it; and if moreover it be condemned by our own Church, and the Laws of our Civil Constitution, and in divers respects tends to the apparent Damage and Destruction of all that shall embrace it, I know not what more can be desired, to detect the Falseness and Absurdity of it. Wherefore to let the Reader see, that this is the true State of the Case, I shall now set myself to maintain these following Charges, against the *Resistance* Mr. *H.* has undertaken to vindicate: That it is contrary,

1. To Scripture.

2. To the Sentiments of the ancient Church.

3. To the Doctrine of our own Church, and its most eminent Divines, who have generally taught and maintained the contrary.

4. To the Laws of the Land.

5. And in the fifth and last place, That a patient Submission and Non-resistance is preferable to it upon divers accounts, as more pleasing to Almighty God, more becoming our Holy Profession, a far likelier method of preserving our Religion, and a surer course for obtaining eternal Happiness hereafter; and withal is not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the generality of the World are too apt to imagine. Each of these Charges, if well made out, must necessarily be a powerful Argument against all Resistance of the *Higher Powers*; but all of them together will leave those utterly inexcusable, who resolve not to be convinced by such abundant Evidence. These therefore I design for the Subject of the remaining part of this Discourse; and in treating of them, I shall also take notice of whatever I think most material, in Mr. *H's.* Answers to the Objections already produced against him.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Whether Mr. H's. *Doctrine of Reſiſtance be agreeable to Scripture?*

THAT Mr. *H.* has no Foundation for this Doctrine in Scripture, I have ſhewn already. And from what has been ſaid, it is eaſy to obſerve moreover, That this Doctrine is not only not taught in Scripture, but is highly condemned by it as falſe and erroneous, and contrary to the Divine Will. Though I have yet ſaid but little more upon that Subject, than what was barely needful, for vindicating the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, from Mr. *H*'s miſinterpretation of them, and to let his Admirers ſee, that our Bleſſed Lord and his Apoſtles have not eſtabliſhed the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, as Mr. *H.* would have them thought to have done.

Wherefore to prove this the more effectually, I am now to produce the Teſtimony of Scripture againſt him, and ſhew what declared Enemies both the Old and New Teſtament are to his darling *Meaſures of Submiſſion.*

And one would think, that whoſoever deliberately attends to what is there written, ſhould ſoon be ſatiſfied, without any nice unneceſſary Enquiries, on which ſide of the Queſtion the Truth lies. For the Duty of Submiſſion to Authority indefinitely, and without reſtriction only to good Princes, and who duly attend to the end of their Inſtitution, is not ſo obſcurely taught there, as to need any Study, or Learning, or diligent Search for the diſcovery of it. And if it appear otherwiſe to any, it can be only to ſuch, whoſe Underſtanding is byaſſed by the power of Prejudice or Intereſt, or that have been chiefly, if not only, converſant in ſuch Authors, as have purpoſely ſet themſelves to ſtart needleſs and unaccountable Difficulties, whereby to perplex and obſcure it, and prepoſſeſs Peoples Minds, and indiſpoſe them for the reception of it.

For beſides that, the Scripture ſtiles Sovereign Princes (*a*) the *Lord's Anointed*, his (*b*) *Miniſters*, his (*c*) *Choſen*; and even his own Name is put upon them, and they are called by no meaner a Title than that of the Gods: (*d*) *I have ſaid ye are Gods, and ye are all the children of the Moſt High:* And before this, (*e*) *Thou ſhalt not revile the Gods:* Which we may aſſure our ſelves was not done caſually, and without deſign, but to raiſe our Eſteem of them, and beget in all Subjects the greater Reverence and Veneration for them, and make every one tremble at the thoughts of depreſſing thoſe, *whom the* Almighty *King* of Heaven and Earth thus *delights to honour*;

Beſides this, let any one read in the Old Teſtament ſuch Prohibitions as theſe; (*f*) *Thou ſhalt not revile the Gods, nor curſe the Ruler of thy people.* (*g*) *Curſe not the King, no not in thy thought; and curſe not the Rich*, the great Men, and ſuch as are in ſubordinate Authority, *in thy Bed-Chamber:* And for this reaſon, That as God himſelf knows all thy moſt ſecret Offences, and whatſoever Wickedneſs of this nature lurks privately in thy Heart, ſo he will not ſuffer it to lie concealed, but by ſome unexpected means or other it ſhall come to light; *For a Bird of the Air ſhall carry the voice, and that which hath Wings ſhall tell the matter.*

Let him obſerve the fifth Commandment, requiring to (*h*) *Honour our Father and our Mother*; which Divines have generally underſtood to relate to the Civil, no leſs than to the Spiritual, and to the Natural Parent.

Let him weigh well the Direction given by *Samuel* to the *Iſraelites*, (*i*) upon their requeſt for a King to rule over them, that they might be governed as their Neighbours round about them were. There firſt, (*k*) he tells them how ill they had done in deſiring another King, when the Lord himſelf was their Sovereign, and governed them by

---

(*a*) 1 Sam. 2. 10. *and* 12. 3. *and* 24. 6. *and many other places.* (*b*) Rom. 13. 4. (*c*) Pſal. 89. 3. *and* 106. 23. (*d*) Pſal. 82. 6. (*e*) Exod. 22. 28. (*f*) Ibid. (*g*) Eccleſ. 10. 20. (*h*) Exod. 20. 12. (*i*) 1 Sam. 8. 5. (*k*) v. 6. *&c.*

by his own more immediate Orders; and how highly he resented this their Petition, and how sorely he was displeased at it. (*a*) *They have not rejected Thee*, says God, *but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.* Then he proceeds to acquaint them, what they were like to get by their change; That their Sons, their Daughters, their Servants and their Cattle, should be taken from them; their Nobles and Freemen should be made Slaves, and employed in mean and servile Offices; and their Goods and Possessions, their Fields, and Vineyards, and Oliveyards should be extorted from them, and given to his Officers and Servants. (*b*) *This will be the manner of the King that shall reign over you: He will take your Sons, and appoint them for himself, for his Chariots, and to be his horsemen, and some shall run before his chariots. And he will appoint him captains over thousands, and captains over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground, and to reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and instruments of his chariots. And he will take your Daughters to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to be bakers. And he will take your fields, and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his Officers, and to his servants. And he will take your men-servants, and your maid-servants, and your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work. He will take the tenth of your sheep, and ye shall be his servants.* And last of all, he prescribes the course they were to take under these Pressures; namely, To make their Complaint to Almighty God, and sue to him for relief. They must expect to lose their Children, their Estates, their Liberty, their Servants, their Cattle, and to be made a Prey, not only to the King but to his Ministers too, his Servants and Officers. And a King that rules thus tyrannically, I dare say Mr. *H.* will not own *to attend continually to the good End of his Institution.* Yet when reduced to this sad condition, the Prophet does not teach them, as Mr. *H.* would have done, to take up

(*a*) 1 Sam. 8. 7. (*b*) v. 11, &c.

Arms in their own Defence, againſt ſuch a mercileſs Invader of their Rights. He does not inſtruct them, that then would be a proper time for them to ſhake off their Yoke, to riſe againſt ſuch an imperious domineering Prince, and depoſe and kill him: Does not recommend it as *glorious and honourable* to rid themſelves of ſo unagreeable a Governor, as no longer fit to be endured. On the contrary, the only proper courſe he could direct them to, for the redreſs of ſuch their Grievances, was, as I ſaid, to refer themſelves and their Cauſe to God, *the King of Kings and Lord of Lords.* (*a*) *Ye ſhall cry in that day, becauſe of your King, which ye ſhall have choſen you, and the Lord will not hear you in that day.* Their King would be very hard upon them, and Almighty God would not hearken to their Cry, when they ſhould implore his Protection in the day of their Calamity, which made their Caſe ſtill abundantly the worſe. And yet how intolerable ſoever their Oppreſſions were, the Prophet does not in the leaſt intimate any other Remedy allowed them, beſides that of Tears and Prayers; not a word of Reſiſting ſo arbitrary and tyrannical a King. All the comfort he gives them is only this, That they ſhould cry becauſe of their King which they had choſen; but ſhould not be heard. As if he had ſaid, How unagreeable ſoever this Uſage will be to you, and though you think your Caſe ever ſo deplorable, yet may you not riſe up againſt your King, to ſhake off his heavy Yoke by Force and Violence. You ſhall only cry to God for relief; and yet neither will he preſently deliver you. However, though he do not, you are only to cry to him; no other Weapons being allowed you, in relation to your Sovereign Lord the King.

Let that Counſel of *Solomon* be attended to, (*b*) פִּי מֶלֶךְ שָׁמֹר *To obſerve the mouth of the King*; that is, as we have it in our Tranſlation, *To keep the King's commandment, and that in regard of the Oath of God. In regard*, ſays (*c*) Biſhop *Patrick*, *(or becauſe of the matter) of the Oath to which God is a Witneſs, and a ſevere Revenger*

of

(*a*) 1 Sam. 8. 18. (*b*) Eccleſ. 8. 2. (*c*) *In* loc.

of the breach of it. And again, (*a*) *My Son, fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change*; or, as it is in the Version of the Seventy Two, μηδ' ἑτέρῳ αὐτῶν ἀπειθήσῃς, *Be disobedient to neither of them.*

Let it farther be observed, what a Character the same wise *Solomon* gives of a King; That he is one (*b*) *against whom there is no Rising up*; that is, says the famous *Bochart*, (*c*) *Against whom none of his Subjects ought to rise; and though many do it, this is always done against Law and Right*; That (*d*) *Where his Word is, there is Power*; and (*e*) *That none may say unto him, What dost thou?* None may call him to an Account for his Doings, he having no superiour but God alone.

Then let a Man cast his Eye upon the New Testament, and observe our Blessed Lord, not only requiring to (*f*) *Render unto Cesar the things that are Cesar's*; and owning (*g*) *Pilate*'s Power, his Authority, and Dominion to be (*h*) *given him from Above*, even when he was about to pass the most abominable and most execrable Judgment, that ever was given in the World; but likewise sharply rebuking St. *Peter*, for drawing his Sword without Commission, though in Defence of the Son of God, and Saviour of the World, saying unto him, (*i*) *Put up again thy Sword into his place, for all they that take the Sword*, that is, of their own Heads, and when not entrusted with it by any Lawful Authority, *shall perish with the Sword.*

Let him look forward to the Apostle St. *Paul*, and see him (*k*) *Enjoining every Soul to be subject to the Higher*

(*a*) Prov. 24. 21. (*b*) Prov. 30. 31.
(*c*) Epist. p. 41. & Phaleg. Par. 2. l. 1. c. 16.
(*d*) Eccles. 8. 4. (*e*) Ibid.
(*f*) *St.* Mat. 22. 21. (*g*) *St.* John 19. 11.
(*h*) *If we consider who* Pilate *was, namely, the* Roman *Governor sent to them by* Cesar, *(the Supreme) we have most plain Testimony, that however wicked Supreme Powers may be, or however wickedly they may use their Power, yet is their Power given them by God, and none may invade it, or take upon him to exercise it, but as they shall impart, or delegate it.* Lord Bishop of *Cork*'s *Christian Law of the Sword*, p. 12.
(*i*) *St.* Mat. 26. 52. (*k*) Rom. 13. 1, 2.

Powers, assuring us *there is no power but of God*; *and the Powers that be*, though such as *Claudius* and *Nero*, and others of the *Roman* Emperors, *are Ordained of God*: And for this reason, *whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God, and they that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation*, as the just Reward of their Disobedience.

Let him hearken to the same Apostle, declaring the Necessity of (*a*) *Subjection*; *and not only for Wrath*, (*b*) or while People are too weak to defend themselves, *but also for Conscience sake*, and even when they are strong enough in all appearance to make head against the *Higher Powers*, with a probable expectation of Success; and again admonishing *Titus* to warn those, committed to his Care, of their Duty in this respect, by (*c*) *putting them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*, Magistrates indefinitely, without confining such their Subjection to good Princes more than to the Bad, to the most diligent and tendereſt of Governors, than to the cruellest of their Persecutors; and ~~and~~ lastly exhorting *Timothy* to see, (*d*) That *Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made*, as *for all Men*, so in a particular manner *for Kings, and all that are in authority*: Which suits not well with fighting against them; and especially if what follows be attended to, namely, Not that we may be enabled to correct and bring them to Reason, if they govern amiss, but *that under them we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all Godliness and Honesty.*

Let him see how St. *Peter* teaches, To (*e*) *submit our selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake*, and not barely for the sake of Publick Peace, and the happiness of Society; *whether it be to the King as Supream, or unto Governors* under him, such as the Proconsuls, Procurators, Deputies, and other Superiours of distant Colonies, *as to those that are* commissioned *and sent by him for*

(*a*) Rom. 13. 5.
(*b*) Milbourn's *Measures of Resistance*, p. 22.
(*c*) Tit. 3. 1. (*d*) 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. (*e*) 1 *St.* Pet. 2. 13, 14.

for the punishment of Evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well; and how a little after he enjoins (*a*) To *fear God and honour the King*; and again a little after that, propounds our blessed Saviour as a Pattern for our imitation, in a patient and quiet Submission to the sharpest and most barbarous Usage; (*b*) *Because Christ also hath suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should tread in his steps; who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatned not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously; who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree*, and not for his own but for our sakes, *that we being dead to sin, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes we are healed*; and who upon this account might justly require and expect from us, that we be ready to suffer after his Example, whensoever God in his wise Providence sees fit to call us to it.

Let him weigh with himself those Words of the Apostle St. *James*, (*c*) κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον, *ye have condemned, ye have slain the Just*, whether many righteous Persons, the Singular being put for the Plural, as (*d*) *Estius* conceives, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν, *and he doth not* (for they do not) *resist you*; or else τὸν δίκαιον that righteous Person to whom this Epithet peculiarly belongs, our ever blessed Saviour, as (*d*) *Oecumenius*, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται, the Present for the Perfect Tense, after the manner of the *Hebrews*, *he did not resist you*, as *Grotius* (*d*) understands the place. Let him, I say, weigh the Words in either of these Senses, and try if he can any way prove it lawful, to take a quite contrary course, when under Persecutions and Sufferings.

Let him proceed farther to St. *Jude*, and observe what a Mark that Apostle sets upon such as (*e*) *despise Dominions, and speak evil of Dignities*, though without ever arming themselves against them; which were a much higher, and a far more offensive degree of Wickedness. Once

(*a*) 1 Pet. 2. 17. (*b*) v. 21, 22, 23, 24.
(*c*) ch. 5. 6. (*d*) In loc. (*e*) v. 8.

Once more let him recollect in the laſt place, and duly weigh with himſelf, that from the beginning of the Bible to the end of it, there is not one Direction for forcible Reſiſtance of our Lawful Superiors, under whatſoever Preſſures and ill Treatment, not one Inſtance ever recommended to our imitation, nor ſo much as any the leaſt hint of the Lawfulneſs of ſuch Proceedings; that we find a great deal in Scripture againſt them, but not one word any where in favour of them.

And then let him ſeriouſly and deliberately conſider with himſelf, if any farther Condemnation of Reſiſtance could be thought needful, ſuppoſing Almighty God had undoubtedly deſigned to prohibit it in all caſes; and if it be not very ſurprizing, that any, who call themſelves our Lord's Ambaſſadors, ſhould act ſo diametrically oppoſite to their Office, as to ſet up for the Defence and Encouragement of it, as it were in open defiance to that holy Word of God, which they are ſent to publiſh. A little Reflection upon the ſeveral Texts here recited, in favour of Kings, and the Honour and Reverence, Submiſſion and Obedience due to them, will eaſily ſuggeſt the Neceſſity of paying them all Duty and Allegiance; Actively, wherever we can do it ſafely and with a good Conſcience, and Paſſively where we cannot do it otherwiſe.

And to ſet up a Plea for *Reſiſtance in ſome caſes*, where the Scripture admits of none, were no better than to prefer our own vain Imaginations, before the undoubted Word of God, which has plainly required our Subjection and Obedience to Governors, but has made no proviſion for any Violence to be offered them, upon whatſoever account.

If this be not enough to evince the Obligation of a Duty thus taught, it will be impoſſible to prove we are obliged to any Duty at all. Since none can appear with greater advantage than this, of being enjoined over and over, and under the ſevereſt Penalties, and moreover without any manner of Reſtriction or Limitation, from the beginning of *Geneſis* to the end of the *Revelation*.

Yet

Yet Mr. *H.* perſuades himſelf he has found out ſomething in moſt of theſe places of Scripture, by virtue whereof it will be lawful, and even *glorious* and *honourable*, for him to reſiſt his Sovereign, whenſoever he ſhall think it neceſſary. But with what Succeſs, will ſoon appear, from a brief Inſpection into the ſeveral Exceptions made by him to theſe Scripture-Evidences againſt Reſiſtance.

I. He ſays, (*a*) If it be forbidden to curſe or ſpeak evil of the King, it is no leſs, to do the like to inferiour Perſons. But then he has neither ſhewn, why Kings are ſingled out from others, and the Curſing of them particularly forbidden, unleſs this were a greater Crime than Curſing an inferiour Perſon; nor has he proved taking up Arms againſt our Sovereign to be a leſs Fault than Curſing him; though he cannot but know, that without ſuch Proof there is no ſort of Argument in his Obſervation.

However he proceeds, *Nor did any one ever infer from thence, that we ought not to think thoſe Men Sinners, who are notoriouſly and apparently ſo.* Which is very true, but not at all to the purpoſe; the Queſtion not being whether it is a Sin to think a wicked King to be a bad Man, or a bad Governor, but only whether it is lawful to Curſe and Reſiſt him as ſuch? Of which here is not the leaſt word.

But this is not all; For *much leſs*, ſays he, may we infer from hence, *that all their Wickedneſs may go unpuniſhed, and uncontrouled.* True again! Nor can Mr. *H.* inſtance in any, who ever inferred from hence, that Malefactors might not be juſtly and legally puniſhed for their Crimes. But it will by no means follow, that becauſe diſorderly Subjects may, and ought to be proceeded againſt according to Law, and by thoſe who are ſufficiently empowered to do it, therefore tyrannical Sovereigns may be puniſhed too, without all Law, and by ſuch as have no Authority over them, nor are any way empowered to proceed againſt them.

But it ſeems he has found out an Attempt of ſome of the

(*a*) P. 129.

the ancient Christians, whom he does not name; but I take it for granted he means the Carriage (*a*) of the *Antiochians* towards *Julian* the Apostate; and not of (*b*) the Christians only, but of the People in general, whether Christians or Heathens; nor of the whole People neither, but of some of the Wits amongst them, of whom *Gregory Nazianzen* relates, That they called the Emperor *Idolianus*, and *Pisæus*, and *Adonæus*, and *Caustiaurus*, from his Worship of Idols, the Honour he paid to *Jupiter* at *Pisa*, his great Reverence for *Adonis*; and the many Bulls he offered in Sacrifice, as (*c*) *Elias Cretensis* observes. And not only with respect to Religion, and the opposition *Julian* made against it, but upon account of the Scarcity of Provisions, occasioned by his Edicts, and his disallowing their Theatres and Plays. They were, as *Ammianus Marcellinus* relates, (*d*) *a luxurious People, lovers of the Theatres, and of plentiful and delicious Fare*, to which finding *Julian* an enemy, they hereupon took occasion to lampoon him. And does Mr. *H.* think this a reason for Subjects contempt to their Prince, and abuse of him, only because he is averse to the gratifying of their vicious and sinful Inclinations? If not, I hope it may still be affirmed of the Christians in general, that they were a submissive, passive body of Men, though some of the People of *Antioch*, who were not so much as in Pretence, and others of them who did not deserve the Name of Christians, behaved themselves indecently and undutifully towards *Julian*. They used (*e*) his Successor *Jovian* too in the same rude manner, a virtuous Prince, and a Patron, Protector and Encourager of the Christians. And broke down (*f*) *Theodosius*'s Statues, not as if he were an ill Emperor, but because they were a disorderly, ungovernable, ill sort of People. Yet these Excesses, not so much as of one City, but only of some of the more facetious and for-

(*a*) Greg. Naz. *Invect.* 3. p. 81.
(*b*) *See* Jovian, chap. III. p. 99.
(*c*) *In* Orat. 3. n. 74. p. 338. D.
(*d*) Jovian, p. 100, 101, 102, 103, 104.
(*e*) Ibid. (*f*) *B.* Chrysost. Ἀνδριάντων, α', β'.

forward, and the more licentious in it, he thinks enough to ſtop the Mouths *of ſuch as make frequent Appeals* to the Primitive Chriſtians *in this Cauſe*; and they muſt never more deny, that *Princes may be laſhed with inimitable Severity*, becauſe a few of the Inhabitants of *Antioch* once took too much liberty this way. And this muſt go for an undoubted Proof, that it is lawful to *curſe* Princes upon occaſion, though at the ſame time we very well know, the Holy Scripture has expreſly forbidden it.

Again, *We are forbid*, ſays he, *to curſe the King, and the like, but this doth not forbid us to maintain our own Rights.* What, by violent and forcible Oppoſition? This wants ſtill to be proved, ſuch a Reſiſtance being abundantly more to the Prince's Hurt, than any of our Curſes can be ſuppoſed to be. And it is not imaginable, that Almighty God would forbid the leſs, and yet allow the far greater and more dangerous Oppoſition.

Nor could Solomon, ſays he again, *be ſuppoſed to put the Caſe of an unjuſt oppreſſing Tyrant, or to lay an Obligation upon Men, to think well of ſuch; which is impoſſible.* And whoever ſaid, theſe Words implied an Impoſſibility? Yet I hope a Man might be forbid to curſe or ſpeak evil of, or do evil to any Man, how impoſſible ſoever it be to have a good Opinion of him. Which is all I would have inferred from this Admonition of the wiſe Man.

II. As for *thoſe Texts in which it is declared, that againſt a King there is no riſing up, and that none may ſay unto him What doſt thou?* He affirms (*a*) that they are ſufficiently explained, *and their full Intent anſwered, (for any thing that can be made appear to the contrary) by applying them to ſuch Kings, as act the part of Kings, and are the Miniſters of publick Juſtice, and Peace to a Nation.* And this, when he very well knows, there is not a tittle in the Words to reſtrain them only to good Kings, nor any thing more to be ſaid for it, but only that it ſuits with

(*a*) p. 121.

with his Scheme, and rather than that ſhould be ſpoil-ed, it muſt be ſo. And this Mr. *H.* is ſo ſenſible of, that he immediately goes off to another Interpretation; namely, *That Kings are poſſeſſed of ſuch Power, that it is a fooliſh thing for private Perſons to provoke them, or contend with them.* And yet he has not, and cannot ſhew, that private Perſons are mentioned here, any more than thoſe who are more publick, or than whole Communities; nor is it any way intimated, that theſe may riſe up againſt their Prince, any more than private Perſons. Which yet were neceſſary to make his Plea of any force. He has not proved, nor ever will be able to do it, that no more is meant by theſe Words, than that it is dangerous at preſent to riſe in Arms againſt a Prince; which I readily aſſent to no leſs than himſelf, and take it to be one good Argument for that quiet Submiſſion I am pleading for. But how does it any way appear, *that there is no riſing againſt a King* upon this account only, and that we are not to forbear it as a Sin? The Apoſtle St. *Paul* requires *to be ſubject not only for wrath, but for conſcience ſake.* And this certainly is the much firmer, and more invincible Bar to Reſiſtance. And Mr. *H.* has ſaid nothing that does in the leaſt evince the contrary to have been intended here.

However, he has made a farther and wonderful Diſcovery, *Whatever*, ſays he, *was intended in this Paſſage; there can be no ſuch thing inferred from it, as that no Perſon may ever reprove, or check, or adviſe a Prince.* Now ſuppoſe this, does it hence follow that we may take up Arms againſt them? Which is what Mr. *H.* would be at, but what he will never know how to reconcile to this Text. *But this*, ſays he again, *is as much againſt the Letter of ſuch Texts as any Oppoſition can be.* This I confeſs I cannot apprehend. And yet if it were ſo, I do not ſee of what advantage it would be to Mr. *H.* or his Cauſe, it being enough for my purpoſe, that ſuch a Procedure is not againſt the natural and moſt obvious Senſe of theſe Texts, and in which any Reader, of but a common and unbyaſſed Apprehenſion, will be ſure to underſtand them.

III. As

III. As to what follows, in relation to *those Texts, which in general Expressions command* to honour the King, and keep his Commandments, *necessarily requiring a limitation*, I need only to refer the Reader to what I have already said, in the last Chapter of the former Part of this Discourse.

IV. The same I say likewise concerning what he repeats about the Necessity of *Active Obedience in all cases, as much as of Passive*; which having fully answered before, I need add no more of it here.

V. To our Lord's Command, (*a*) *to give Cesar the things that are Cesar's*, he answers, *That our Lord commands to give Kings their due; and to this all the World agree*; but withal, *that notwithstanding any thing in this Precept, we are left to judge what are the things that are Cesar's.* But then I hope, where the Rights of Princes are settled by the Laws of the Constitution, we must judge not by our own Fancies, but according to those Laws. And more particularly in our own Nation, if our Laws declare the Prince to be irresistible, as I shall shew beyond Contradiction in its proper place, these Words enforce the paying that Due, as well as others. Which is all the use that was designed to be made of them.

VI. He farther argues, *That* (*b*) *our Lord's forbidding his Disciples to resist those*, (*c*) *who came unjustly to apprehend and murder him, doth not necessarily infer any thing, but that his Design in coming into the World being to lay down his Life voluntarily for the good of Mankind, and the proper time of doing it being now come, their Resistance and Opposition was not at all proper and convenient.* And this I deny not to be the Sense of *v.* 53, 54. *Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?* Yet even in this case, the learned Dr. *Hammond*'s Note is worthy of Observation, *That* (*d*) *as Christ was decreed to that Death and Non-resistance, so are Christians, if St.* Paul *may be believed,*

(*a*) p. 124. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) *St.* Mat. 26.
(*d*) *Of resisting the Lawful Magistrate*, &c. p. 304.

lieved, predeſtinated to be conformed to the Image of his Son, *Rom.* 8. that is, *to that Pattern of his ſuffering, not fighting, for Religion. And that Revelation of God's Will in the Decree being ſuppoſed, it will follow, that though Chriſt might lawfully have done otherwiſe, yet we Chriſtians now may not; eſpecially being commanded to learn of him, particularly his Meekneſs*; 1. e. *eſpecially that Lamb-like quality of the Lamb of God in his Sufferings*, Iſ. 53. 7.

But this is not the whole of our Saviour's Reproof of St. *Peter*, nor is it any part of what was alledged againſt Mr. *H.* as he very well knows. The Argument againſt him is taken from *v.* 52. *Put up again thy ſword into its place, for all they that take the ſword, ſhall periſh by the Sword.* As if our Saviour ſhould have ſaid, (*a*) They who take the Sword, without any lawful Commiſſion empowering them to make uſe of it, *ſhall periſh by the Sword*; not prophetically, that this ſhall always be the certain and undoubted event of ſuch Diſloyalty, but meritoriouſly, as being what it always deſerves, and very often meets with accordingly. Such are guilty of Murder in the ſight of God, and have thereby a right to the Puniſhment of it, which is to fall by the Sword of Juſtice. This is a plain and obvious Senſe of the Words; and ſuch as that Mr. *H.* has but one Exception to it, and that ſuch as will ſtand him in very little ſtead. *Our Saviour*, ſays Mr. *H.* (*b*) *it being his Reſolution not to call in the Aſſiſtance which he could command, might well require his Diſciples to ceaſe their fruitleſs Endeavours; and put them in mind that by their Reſiſtance in this Cauſe, they would only endanger their own Lives, but not ſecure his, which he was now determined voluntarily to give up.* But Mr. *H.* if he ſhall pleaſe to look once more upon the Words, may eaſily ſee there is nothing in them to limit them only to St. *Peter* and his company, or to that preſent Juncture, and that they are delivered in ſuch general indefinite Terms, as to be rather a ſtanding Rule

(*a*) Ille gladium accipit, qui nullâ ſuperiori ac legitimâ poteſtate jubente vel concedente, in ſanguinem alicujus armatur. *Gratian.* in Jus Can. Cauſ. 23. Qu. 4. Ille gladium.

(*b*) p. 125.

Rule for all Subjects, at all Times, and in all Places, cautioning them of both the Sin and Danger of taking up Arms against their lawful Superiours. That they are to be understood in this extent, may justly be inferred from the manner of Expression our Saviour uses, not suiting his Denunciation to the particular Case of St. *Peter*, in relation to whom he would most probably have said, *If thou takest the Sword*, &c. nor that of the Disciples alone, for then he would have needed only to change the Number, not the Person he spake in; but of all Mankind, so as to be a lasting Direction to all that should come after, as well as to themselves. For he expresses himself without any Reserve, in as universal Terms as may be; *All they that*, whosoever now or at any other time, *take the Sword, shall perish by the Sword.* Which the late Dr. *Sherlock*, with very good Reason, (*a*) affirms to be as expressly spoken against Resistance as may be. And Mr. *H.* may easily learn from it, that it is a great Truth which he denies, when he denies our Saviour (*b*) to have *founded his Non-resistance upon the Unlawfulness of the contrary.* And till he shall own himself convinced of this, I would entreat him to try, how he can answer the present Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*, asserting, in direct Contradiction to what is here suggested, (*c*) That *the only thing that can be imagined, to have been capable of fixing so severe a Censure upon St.* Peter's *Action, must have been this*; *That the Persons against whom he drew his Sword were the Ministers, and commissioned by a legal Authority to take our Blessed Saviour*; *and that being such, they were not to be resisted in the Execution of their Office*; with more to the same purpose. And a little after, speaking of defending Religion by force of Arms, (*d*) *This*, says his Lordship, *I take to be clear and certain, That had we no other Passage of Holy Scripture to convince us of the Falseness of such a Pretension, No Directions of any ancient Writers to inform us what the Duty*

(*a*) *Case of Resistance*, ch. 2. p. 59. (*b*) p. 125.
(*c*) *Sermon before the House of Lords*, Jan. 30. 1707. p. 8. in 8vo. (*d*) *Ibid.* p. 10.

of a Christian in times of Persecution is, No Examples of Antiquity to shew us what his Behaviour ought to be; this single Passage, and Example, alone, might suffice to assure us, how directly contrary such a Principle must be, both to the Practice *of our* Saviour *and the* Rule *of his* Gospel.

But Mr. *H.* is resolved to be very obliging, and to *allow the most that can be inferred from this Passage*; only it unhappily falls out, that his Inference is quite wrong. His Words are these, *It will only follow from hence, that our Lord thought fit to submit in his own private Case to* Injustice *and* Oppression. *This*, as he proceeds, *I never argued against. But I think it hard to infer from hence, that it was his Will, that whole Nations should submit themselves, and their Posterity, to be ruined at the Will of cruel and unjust Governors.* As if Mr. *H.* should have said; *First*, All *they*, must necessarily mean, not all that take the Sword upon whatsoever occasion, as the Words most plainly import, nor indeed any but S. *Peter* and they that joined with him: And again, *secondly*, Private Christians are obliged to conform themselves to our Blessed Saviour's Pattern, who *left us an Example* of patient Suffering, *that we should tread in his Steps*, but whole Nations of his Disciples are not. Which manifestly supposes our Saviour, to have given one sort of Laws to his Disciples as Men and Christians, and another quite contrary to these same Persons as Members of Society. Which Mr. *H.* may *think* as long as he pleases, but it is as far from Truth as any thing in the World can be. But let us attend to what follows.

VII. *Our Blessed Lord's Declaration*, says Mr. *H.* (*a*) *That* Pilate *could have had no Power against him, unless it had been given him from above, is, I think as foreign to this purpose, as any thing that can well be imagined.* This shews Mr. *H.* is not infallible: for if he will please to *think* again, he may possibly find it not so far from the purpose as he *imagines*. I am sure he has said nothing that will prove it to be so. Nor can he; for our Saviour here owns *Pilate*'s Right of Judging to be from God,

(*a*) P. 126.

God, and that he is set to act as God's Minister; and if he would so grosly abuse the Power thus entrusted with him, as, for whatsoever secular end, to pass a Sentence of Condemnation upon the most Righteous Person in the World, the dearly beloved Son of God, our Saviour's (*a*) Submission in such a case, and his acknowledgment of the Power by which he was condemned, though most unjustly, whatever Mr. *H.* may think, is not at all foreign from his purpose, of teaching his Disciples a quiet Submission to the ill Treatment of their lawful, but cruel and unjust Governors.

Knowest thou not, says *Pilate* to our Saviour, *that I have (b) power to crucify thee, and I have power to release thee?* To which Question had Mr. *H.* been to return Answer, and would he have done it consonantly to his own Principles, he must have told *Pilate*, not only that Crucifying the Lord of Life was a most abominable Wickedness, and at the least thought of which every Joint of him ought to tremble, and the utmost Horror and Astonishment to seize his Mind, as is most true; but moreover that by such an outrageous Attempt, he would lose all pretence to his wonted Authority, and all his Subjects would thence-forward be at liberty to look upon him as a Tyrant, and rise up against him, and expel him the Nation, and shew him no Pity or Humanity, because he did not act as became a good Governor, but was become a *Terrour to good Works*, not *to the Evil*, and so not only had justly forfeited, but had actually divested himself of all Right to govern any longer, and not only the Emperor, but the People might take him to task for it, whenever they pleased. This must have been Mr. *H's.* Reply. But does our Blessed Saviour make any such Return? Nothing like it; but on the contrary, he puts him in mind that he ought by no means to abuse the Power wherewith he was entrusted, inasmuch as it

C 2 was

(*a*) *S.* James 5. 6.

(*b*) *Not* δύναμις, *but* ἐξουσία. Ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί σε, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω ἀπολῦσαί σε. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν. *S.* John 19. 10, 11.

was derived from God Almighty, the ſole Fountain of all Power; and by whom alone it is that Kings, and Princes, and their inferiour Magiſtrates, are commiſſioned to decree Juſtice. *Thou couldſt have no Power againſt me, except it were given thee from above.*

And this Anſwer is the more remarkable, becauſe it implies the Emperor *Tiberius*, by whoſe mediation this Commiſſion deſcended to *Pilate*, to reign by God's Authority. I hope Mr. *H.* will not commend him as an excellent Governor, as one who in the ſtricteſt Senſe *did not bear the Sword in vain*, and was *a Terrour not to good Works, but to the Evil.* The Hiſtorians who write of that time give a very different account of him, complaining (*a*) of his Remiſneſs in Government, his (*b*) Licentiouſneſs and extravagant Luſts, his (*c*) Covetouſneſs, and (*d*) Parſimony, his (*e*) Greedineſs and Rapine, his (*f*) Cruelty towards his Friends and neareſt Relations, and his (*g*) inſatiable Barbarity towards others; yet however our Saviour acknowledges him, with all his Faults, to have the ſupreme Authority ſtill reſiding in him, and that his Commiſſion to *Pilate* was valid, and conveyed to him a Power of Life and Death. Otherwiſe our Saviour could not have owned *Pilate* to have his Power and Authority from God; as he moſt unqueſtionably does. And if two ſuch ill Governors as theſe did, one immediately, and the other at a farther diſtance, derive their Authority from God, I cannot conceive but that Mr. *H.* upon a review of this *Declaration of our Lord*, muſt allow it to be not only not ſo foreign as he imagines, but very pat and pertinent to the caſe in hand, and that it is a very proper Argument for proving the Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſting a wicked, unjuſt,

---

(*a*) Eutrop. *l.* 7. Suet. *vit.* Tib. *c.* 38, 41.
(*b*) Suet. *c.* 42, 43, 44, 45. Eutrop. *l.* 7. Tacit. *Annal.* *l.* 6. *ab initio.* (*c*) Suet. *c.* 46. Eutrop. *l.* 7.
(*d*) Suet. *c.* 47, 48. (*e*) *C.* 49.
(*f*) Id. *c.* 52, 53, 54, 55. Tacit. *Annal. l.* 6. *p.* 153.
(*g*) Suet. *c.* 61, 62. Eutrop. *l.* 7. Tacit. *Ann. l.* 1. *p.* 6. *l.* 4. *p.* 106. *l.* 6. *p.* 132, 159. Dion. & Ziph. *in* Tiber.

unjuſt, tyrannical Governor, if God at any time ſhall ſee fit for our Sins to ſet ſuch an one over us.

VIII. Thus Mr. *H.* proceeds in relation to his Text; (*a*) *Of that celebrated Paſſage*, Rom. 13. 1, 2, *&c. I have, I hope, given a full and ſatisfactory account in the foregoing Chapter; and have nothing farther to add.* Which is all he ſays in this place. But upon another occaſion he boaſts of plain and full Evidence from it, as if there remained now no Pretence for doubting, whether he had not cleared it beyond all Contradiction. *I have on my ſide*, ſays he, (*b*) *a poſitive Argument, drawn from the Character given by S.* Paul *himſelf, of thoſe Higher Powers and Rulers of whom he is ſpeaking; and therefore may juſtly expect ſomething at leaſt as poſitive, taken from S.* Paul's *own Expreſſion, to invalidate the force of this. But I find I may wait long enough, before I receive this Satisfaction.* By this one would think theſe Words of S. *Paul* to be indiſputably on Mr. *H*'s ſide, and that the Apoſtle were very poſitive, as poſitive as Mr. *H.* can deſire, for Reſiſtance upon occaſion. And yet *let him read over theſe ſeven Verſes five hundred times*, to uſe his own Expreſſion, (*c*) *and ſee if he can find one word there* in behalf of it, or can make out that the Apoſtle ever teaches the Lawfulneſs of it, or invites, or encourages, or ſo much as gives any the leaſt countenance to it. Nothing is more plain, than that he moſt expreſly forbids it, and under pain of *Damnation*, and requires the contrary *not only for Wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake*; but not the leaſt hint appears in defence of Reſiſtance upon whatever account, as permitted to Chriſtians. Let Mr. *H.* reflect upon this, *and then judge who do moſt honour the Apoſtle; they who only declare what they find* expreſly ſpoken by him, *or they who will not allow him to ſpeak any thing fit for an Apoſtle to ſay*, or indeed who will not admit of what he does undoubtedly ſay, any farther than it ſuits with their own preconceived Notions and Hypotheſes. *How muſt this way of arguing reflect at laſt upon the Apoſtle him-*

(*a*) P. 127. (*b*) *Againſt Dr.* Atterbury, p. 19.
(*c*) *Anſwer to Dr.* Att. p. 45.

himself, that he must not be allowed to say what he has said, and yet at the same time must be charged with having said, what he never did, or could say? *Unhappy Apostle!* (to use Mr. *H*'s. own manner of Expression still) *not to know his own design, nor to prosecute it in a better method! that he should principally mean* to condemn all Resistance of the Higher Powers, as utterly unlawful, and yet argue in such a manner, as if it were lawful to resist a bad Governor! or else according to Mr. *H*'s Scheme, that he intended to press Obedience only to good Rulers, and yet at the same time took occasion to forbid resisting any Governors whatsoever; and particularly such as were at that time, though far enough from being such as to whom alone Mr. *H.* will grant Obedience to be due. *What account can be given of this? Is it not true, literally true, that he doth not in expreſs words,* or indeed so much as by implication, mention a Liberty to *resist* our lawful Governors, when even such as the Emperors under whom he lived? And *is it not as true, that he* declares *expressly* that they *are God's Ordinance,* that *there is no Power but of God,* and that *the Powers that be are ordained of God,* and that *he has woven* this *too closely into his Argument to be separated from it? S.* Paul's *avoiding the expreſs,* and even so much as oblique *approbation of* Resistance, *is to me a Demonstration that his design at that time,* as well as all others, was to put the utmost Bar against it. *Had it been otherwise, who can think but that instead of saying as he doth, Let every Soul be subject to the Higher Powers, for there are no Powers but of God, and the Powers that be, are ordained of God, he must necessarily have been led to say,* Let every Soul be subject to those Powers only who govern as they ought; these you must obey, for their Care of the *Publick Safety and Happiness*; but if *they deflect from this,* they are no longer *the Ordinance of God,* but *it is Honourable and Glorious to oppose them*; nay under such Governors *a Passive Non-resistance will appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary? But all who can think will I hope allow, that the Apostle knew best his own design, was the fittest Judge of what it became him to say, that what*

he

he hath ſaid doth truly become him; and that we ought to take his own expreſs Words as the Rule for finding out his Deſign, or rather as the only undoubted indication of his Intent and Meaning. It is a vain attempt to ſay, he ſpeaks only of good Rulers, when he ſpeaks of Rulers in general, and poſitively teaches *there is no Power*, whether gentle or cruel, juſt or unjuſt, *but from God, and whoſoever therefore reſiſteth the Power*, the Power indefinitely, *reſiſteth the Ordinance of God*, and *ſhall receive Damnation* for it; it is a vain attempt, I ſay, to affirm that theſe Words relate to none but good Governors, when it is plain they ſpeak of Governors without any reſtriction. Nor is it to be imagined, that any Reader of but tolerable Underſtanding, and who comes with an unbyaſſed Mind to the conſideration of them, ſhould ever put ſuch a contrary interpretation upon them. Mr. *H.* indeed has ſhewn his Ingenuity in doing it: But whether he had not much better have left them to be underſtood in their own natural genuine Senſe, than to have preached againſt his Text, and then undertaken an elaborate *Vindication* of what he thus preached, is worthy his ſerious and impartial Conſideration. And he would do well deliberately, and as in the ſight of God the Judge of all, both Men and Actions, to weigh with himſelf, how ſad an Evidence this is, of (*a*) *a heady concern for an Hypotheſis, and a cold regard for a matter of infinitely greater importance.* I am ſure, Mr. *H.* in this is ſo far from following the Apoſtle, as he profeſſes he ought to do, that it is a flat Contradiction to all he has ſaid upon this ſubject; as I hope I have ſufficiently ſhewn in the former Treatiſe. Whither therefore I refer Mr. *H.* for the Satisfaction he demands; and am pretty confident he may meet with it there, if it be not his own Fault. At preſent I ſhall beg leave to ſubjoin Mr. *Calvin*'s Judgment in the Caſe; profeſſing, *That* (*b*) *whenever the Command of the Publick Society is commit-*

(*a*) *Exam. of the Patr. Scheme*, p. 90.

(*b*) In homine deterrimo honoreq; omni indigniſſimo, penes quem modò ſit publica poteſtas, præclaram illam & divinam

ted to a bad Prince, though even the worſt, and moſt unworthy of all Honour that can be, that illuſtrious and divine Power which God in his Word confers upon the Miniſters of his Juſtice and Judgment, henceforward reſides in him; and he is for this reaſon to have the ſame Reverence and Submiſſion paid him by his Subjects, as to their common Obedience, that they would have paid to the beſt of Kings, if they had had him. And again, a little after, (*a*) *If we are cruelly tortured by an outrageous Prince, or robbed and ſpoiled by one that is either covetous or luxurious, or are neglected through Sloath, or laſtly if a wicked and ſacrilegious Prince perſecute us for our Religion; this ſhould put us in mind of our Iniquities, which have provoked God to chaſtiſe us with ſuch Scourges, that ſo our Humility may reſtrain our Impatience. We ſhould alſo bethink ourſelves, that it is not our buſineſs to cure theſe Evils; and that all we have to do is to implore God's help; in whoſe Hand, the Hearts of Kings, and the State of their Kingdoms are.* And not much different is that of his Friend *Beza*, who teaches (*b*) *That the Apoſtle does not command to* obey *the Magiſtrate only when we cannot avoid it, as if it were lawful at another time to ſhake off his Yoke, but rather becauſe it is moſt Juſt for us to be ſubject to God's Miniſter, and that this is no indifferent matter, but what we are obliged to in Conſcience; and none can with a good Conſcience reſiſt him, to whom God has put him in ſubjection; and they that do it oppoſe not the Magiſtrate only, but God himſelf.* And withal, *That it is one thing not to obey a Prince commanding what is ſinful, and forcibly to reſiſt him is another: And though the one may and ought to be done, the other never muſt without a particular warrant from God for it;* which Mr. *H.* does not pretend to be given to any of thoſe whom he is ſo induſtriouſly preparing for Reſiſtance upon the firſt occaſion they ſhall apprehend themſelves to meet with for it.

IX. That

---

nam poteſtatem reſidere, quam Dominus juſtitiæ ac judicii ſui Miniſtris verbo ſuo detulit: proinde à ſubditis eâdem in reverentiâ & dignatione habendum, quantum ad publicam obedientiam attinet, quâ optimum Regem, ſi daretur, habituri eſſent. *Calv.* Inſtit. *l.* 4. *c.* 20. §. 25.

(*a*) §. 29. (*b*) *In* Rom. 13. 5.

IX. That Direction of S. *Paul* to *Titus*, That he *put* People *in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*, Mr. *H.* takes no notice of; and therefore I shall not insist upon it here, save only so far as to desire the Reader to try, if with his utmost Skill any thing can be squeezed out of it, in favour of the Doctrine of Resistance.

X. That the Order given to *Timothy*, (*a*) For *Prayers, Supplications, Intercessions and Giving of Thanks, to be made for Kings and all in Authority*, should be brought against *Resistance*, to prove that it *must in all cases be a Sin*, (*b*) is what Mr. *H.* cannot assent to; and he thinks it *without all Foundation*. And for this Reason, *Because we are required in unlimited Expressions to pray for our Enemies; and this does not imply that we are to pray in an unlimited manner for them*; nor may we pray for our Governors *Prosperity* and *Success*, in what is Destructive of the Publick Good. All which, I must take the freedom to tell Mr. *H.* is quite besides the business. For if he had thought to look forward to the next Words, he would have found that our *Prayers for Kings* are not enjoined *in unlimited Expressions*, but here is a particular Direction in relation to them, that the scope of them be, *That under them we may lead quiet and peaceable Lives, in all Godliness and Honesty*. And I am very apt to think Mr. *H.* will not say, either that we are directed any where to pray in these terms with respect to our Enemies; or again, that these Prayers for our Governors and Resistance of them will well consist together, and a good Christian and loyal Subject may, at the same time, fairly and honestly do both.

XI. The Words of S. *Peter* come next to be considered, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governors, as to those that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the Will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence* the ignorance of foolish Men, 1 S. *Pet.* 2. 12, 13, 14.

On

(*a*) 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. (*b*) P. 131.

On which the learned Archbishop *Usher* (*a*) recommends these following Observations. *First*, That this word κτίσις *doth signify either a* Creation, *or a* Creature ; *by both which the holy Writers express the Work, not of any mortal Man, but of the Almighty and everliving God.* Secondly, *That this in Scripture is not restrained to the first Creation of all things only, but extended likewise to the Works of God's Providence, whether wrought by himself immediately, or by the intervention of other secondary Causes.* Thirdly, *That S.* Peter *by* every human Creature *intendeth to signify here, not Things but Persons ; as is manifest by the Division subjoined,* Whether it be to the King as supreme, or unto Governors. Fourthly, *That as Man, who by God's Ordinance was appointed to have Dominion over the other Creatures, hath by way of Excellency the name of* κτίσις, *or* Creature, *attributed unto him, as bearing therein a peculiar Stamp of the Image of his Creator ; so among Men themselves, such as by God's appointment are advanced to the Dignity of bearing rule over others, by like proportion may in a more especial manner, have the word* Creature *appropriated unto them, as carrying a deeper impression of this Image, and likewise of their Creator, by that Power it hath pleased him to grant to them, even over those to whom over the other Works of his Hands he hath given Dominion.* And again, *Fifthly*, That *such a Creature may very properly, for distinction sake, obtain the name of* ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, *as God's especial* Creature *among and over Men.* For as (*b*) every Priest taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins ; *so every civil Magistrate also taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in things pertaining to Men,* (*c*) That they may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and Honesty. From which Premises this great Primate concludes *the full meaning of the Apostle* Peter *in this place should be,* Submit your selves to every Creature, *or to every Man, who is a Creature constituted by God, among and over Men* ; for the Lord's sake, *whose Creature he is in*

(*a*) *Power of the Prince,* Part. I. Sect. VI, VII, VIII, IX, X.
(*b*) Heb. 5. 1. (*c*) 1 Tim. 2. 2.

in that place of Authority. And our Church mentioning these Words of the Apostle in one of her Homilies, declares them to be (*a*) *so plain of themselves* as to need no Explication.

Yet this is not enough to satisfy Mr. *H.* for be they as plain as may be, he can find out a different Interpretation here, as well as he could for *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. He knows how to find a Knot in a Bulrush, as readily as any Man. And accordingly he observes these following Particulars.

1. The Apostle *commands* Submission *to* Human Authority, *in general Terms, without defining the Measures of it.* Which I do not deny. But then I must desire Mr. *H.* to remember, that it is *Submission* that is commanded, and it will be hard for him to find a licence to *Resist* in a command to *Submit*, how general soever the Terms of it be. And whereas he adds, that *these Expressions were designed to recommend* Active, *as well as* Passive Obedience, *and that some cases must be excepted in relation to That*, the Reader must needs be sensible, that that Objection has been so oft repeated, and has received so full an Answer, that it would be but lost labour to say any thing of it here.

2. *He presses Submission*, says Mr. *H. to Governors sent by the King, as his* Viceroys, *into particular Countries*; and from hence he concludes, that they *being sent for the Punishment of Evil-doers, and for the Praise of them that do Well*, no Submission therefore is due to them any longer, than they faithfully answer this End of their Office. Which Argument labours under these several Defects. *First*, He supposes it lawful to Resist such *Viceroys*, as do not rightly discharge their Duty in the Places they are sent to, not considering that Resisting them is Resisting the King, or Emperor, by whom they are sent. And it is not reasonable that he should be Resisted for their Faults, which he has no way designed, or been privy to. It may happen that an upright and just Emperor may be mistaken in the Persons he trusts with

(*a*) *Third part of the Serm. of Obedience*, p. 70.

with his Power. And Mr. *H.* has not yet ſaid that a good Governor is to be reſiſted, purely for being unhappily impoſed upon, by the fair Pretences of ſuch as had been too cunning for him. *Secondly*, He here according to cuſtom, reſolves all the Authority of theſe *Viceroys*, into the Peace and Happineſs of thoſe over whom they are ſet, and ſo makes them Reſiſtible whenſoever they act contrary to this. Which having largely ſhewn to be his grand fundamental Miſtake, I need ſay no more of it here. *Thirdly*, He takes no notice that the Apoſtle requires Submiſſion *for the Lord's ſake*; which is a different Reaſon for it from that of *Publick Good*, and makes all Reſiſtance highly criminal.

3. He urges farther, that S. *Peter* requires this Submiſſion in order to the *putting a ſtop to a Scandal raiſed upon* Chriſtians, *as if they had pretended an Exemption from ſuch an Obedience, and were Enemies to ſo uſeful an Office as that of Magiſtrates.* But ſure this is no Proof that they ought not to be obedient, as was before required, but that they ſhould the rather be ſo. This is a farther Argument for Submiſſion to Governors, that they ought to pay it out of regard to their moſt holy Religion, and as they tendred the Honour and Reputation of That. But what Mr. *H.* can infer from hence, in behalf of that Reſiſtance which the Apoſtle diſſuades from, by inviting to *ſubmit*, not only for the Lord's ſake, but alſo for the Credit of Religion, is paſt my underſtanding to conceive.

4. *S.* Peter, ſays Mr. *H. argues the Chriſtians into Submiſſion from the Uſefulneſs of Magiſtrates to Human Society.* And be it ſo; let this be one of the Arguments he uſes to this purpoſe; it is notorious he uſes two others to the ſame purpoſe, that this Submiſſion is to be paid *for the Lord's ſake*, who enjoins and expects it from us; and for our Religion ſake, which would be highly diſparaged by the Undutifulneſs and Diſloyalty of its Profeſſors. And now ſuppoſe the firſt of theſe Reaſons for Submiſſion ceaſe, there is no Pretence for imagining, the other two muſt both ceaſe with it; and yet till they do ceaſe, there can be no Liberty of Reſiſtance.

XII. The

XII. The Apostle exhorts *Servants (a) to be subject to their Masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward*; and gives this Reason of his Exhortation, *For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience towards God endure grief, suffering wrongfully*; and Mr *H.* is highly offended *(b)* That *some Writers should pretend to draw an Argument from hence for Absolute* Passive-obedience *in Subjects. S.* Peter, says he, *advises Slaves, who were in a state of perfect Captivity, to bear with the evil Treatment their Masters might sometimes bestow upon them; putting them in mind that the great Glory of* Patience *is to bear Injuries, and unjust Usage, without reviling or revenge. But Subjects, generally speaking, are not in a state of Captivity, and therefore it is absurd to suppose he would lay down the same Precepts for both.* This is easily said, but Mr. *H.* should have proved this Absurdity, and not expected Persons to depend upon his bare Word for it. Here, says *(c) Grotius*, are two things to be noted: *First*, That what is spoken of being subject even to hard Masters, is to be no less understood in relation to Kings, inasmuch as what follows as the Superstructure upon this Foundation, respects the Duty of Subjects, as well as that of Servants: And *Secondly*, That such Subjection is required of us, as implies a patient suffering of Injuries; as has used to be said of Parents, *(d) Ama parentem, sæpius est; si non, feras:* Love a kind and good Father; and bear with him that is otherwise. To the same purpose also S. *Augustin, (e)* having spoken of the Duty of Servants even to bad Masters, adds *what I have said of Masters and Servants, is to be understood of Kings and all the Higher Powers.* And certainly there is no Incongruity in giving the same Precept to Two that owe the same Duty, though it be upon very different accounts. A Son and his Father's Servant are both obliged to the same Duty, of Obedience to the same Person, but in different respects, yet sure Mr. *H.* will

---

(a) V. 18, 19. *(b)* P. 128.
(c) De jur. B. & P. *l.* 1. *c.* 4. *n.* 4. §. 6.
(d) Terent. Hecyr. *(e) In* Psal. 124.

will not say, it is an Absurdity to invite them both to the performance of this one Duty, to which they are thus differently obliged. A hired Servant is not a Slave, and yet so long as both are obliged to Fidelity and Submission to their Master, there is no Absurdity in requiring them to behave themselves accordingly; and even in the Apostle's Words, *not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.* A Layman is not a Clergyman, and yet there is no Absurdity in requiring them both to Pray to and Worship God. And so in multitudes of other cases. And there is not the least Pretence for any more Absurdity in relation to Subjects and Slaves; nor any Reason why this Precept of the Apostle may not suit the one, as well as the other. Especially if we attend to the following Words; *For this is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure Grief, suffering wrongfully.* For I am very sure there is nothing in this Argument that is peculiar to Slaves, and does not equally concern all that are unjustly used by their Superiours, in whatsoever station.

But he argues farther; *S.* Peter *is not content to preach Submission to these* Slaves *in general Terms, but puts the case of ill natured, and hard, and unreasonable Masters, from whence one would be apt to argue, that if he had intended the same in the case of* Tyrannical Princes, *he would as plainly have said so, as he doth in the case of Masters.* And hath he not done it very clearly, in forbidding to Resist such Princes as *Claudius* and *Nero*, and such Governors as they should send to rule the Provinces under their Dominion? Under which of these Emperors this Epistle was written *(a)* is not yet determined, *(b)* though most incline to think it was under the former. But which soever of them then reigned, how could the Apostle more plainly declare the Necessity, of submitting to the worst of Princes, than by requiring it to such an

(a) See Dr. Whitby's *Preface to this Epistle.*

(b) Dr. Hammond *Annotat. D.* Cavei *Hist. Liter.* p. 5. A Lapide *in* 1 *Ep. S.* Pet. *Proœm.* Du Pin *Nov. Biblioth.* To. I. *Dissert. Prelim.* p. 68. *& Dissert. Prelim. sur la Bible.* l. 2. c. 10. p. 62.

an one? And that Mr. *H.* cannot see, what is so evident to every one that does not wilfully shut his Eyes, I can resolve into nothing but a *heady concern for an Hypothesis*, that will not suffer him to look before him. If the Apostle had only forbidden Slaves to resist such a Master as *Vedius Pollio*, *(a)* who inhumanly ordered one of his Servants to be thrown into the Pond to feed his Fishes, only for breaking of a Glass, would not this have been accounted a sufficient Admonition not to resist any the most imperious and mercileſs Master? And it is to all Intents and Purposes as reasonable to conclude, that a Prohibition of Subjects resisting a *Claudius* or a *Nero*, should be understood to prohibit the resisting any the worst of Princes. And it is but vain therefore for Mr. *H.* to fancy S. *Peter* has not condemned the Resistance of bad Governors, since it is plain he requires to be subject to every supreme Ruler; and this too in the time of such a Prince as one of these forementioned, hereby shewing that the Submission he requires is due to those that notoriously *deflect from their Duty*, and act much against the End of their Institution.

And yet farther, had S. *Peter* not so plainly required to be subject to wicked and destructive Princes, might not one argue against Mr. *H.* that the Apostle might not name tyrannical Princes, because he might reckon this following Instruction to Servants, to serve in like manner as a warning to Subjects not to rise against their Princes, who have a Power paramount to that of Masters, and over the Masters themselves no less than the meanest of their Servants, or because the Duty of Subjects had been so often inculcated in other parts of Scripture, or for some other less obvious Reason? Whatsoever was the the cause of this Omission, if it were one, I cannot conceive Mr. *H.* will lay so great Stress upon it, as to think it a sufficient ground to venture his eternal Salvation upon, since nothing can be concluded from it, and especially in opposition to many other Texts of Scripture, requiring Submission to, and forbidding

(a) Senec. de Ira, *l.* 3. *c.* 40.

ding all Reſiſtance of the *Higher Powers*, and more particularly to the Words of this Apoſtle himſelf, enjoining in general Terms, *To ſubmit to every humane Ordinance*, *or* Creature, *for the Lord's ſake*, and for our Religion's ſake.

Once more Mr. *H.* takes it for an Evidence, that the Apoſtle S. *Peter*'s Injunction does not require a Submiſſion in all caſes, becauſe delivered only in general Terms, and he does not particularize *froward* and tyrannical Princes, to be ſubmitted to, as in the caſe of Maſters. But I think I have already ſhewn that he has plainly enough declared this Submiſſion due to bad Princes, ſuch as he lived and wrote under. And yet ſuppoſe he had not, I would deſire Mr. *H.* to put the caſe in a parallel Inſtance, and ſee then what appearance it will have, and what his own determination would be concerning it. Suppoſe a Highwayman ſhould plead for himſelf that he did not delight in Robbery, but condemned it, (as Mr. *H.* ſays *he does Reſiſtance*) and only uſed it in great Streights, and when he muſt be utterly undone without it. He wants Money, and knows not how to live, but by taking this courſe to relieve his Neceſſities. And yet in all his greateſt Streights he takes great care, to rob none but who are rich, and can eaſily ſpare ſo much as his occaſions call for. So that whatſoever they may think of it, he is ſure no real Hurt is done them. Poſſibly he has only eaſed them of what they would have ſpent in Riot and Exceſs, Lewdneſs and Debauchery, to the ruin of their immortal Souls, or in unjuſt and needleſs Lawſuits, not only to their own, but to their Neighbour's Damage and Vexation. And upon theſe conſiderations, he did nothing but what was *honourable and glorious* in ſeizing it, and putting it to a better uſe than they would have done. And what fault can there be in this? If he got it by Stealth and Robbery, ſo long as he could not have it otherwiſe, and he took care never to wrong the Poor of any thing how ſmall ſoever, who will blame him for it? He has read the Scriptures daily, and ſearched them carefully from the beginning to the end, and has well and ſeriouſly weighed

weighed the Eighth Commandment, and other Texts againſt Stealing, and he cannot diſcover his Practice to be any where condemned by them. They are all *in general Terms*, and he can no where find the caſe put of a poor Man's robbing the Rich. Robbery is indeed forbidden at large; but no prohibition appears as to this particular caſe. So that he has good reaſon to believe, he is yet ſafe as to the other World, if he can but eſcape as well in this. Eſpecially conſidering how urgent his own, and his Family's Neceſſities are, and how unnatural a Parent and Husband he muſt be, if he do not take this courſe to provide for them. Nor is it to be ſuppoſed the Scripture ſhould have ſo little regard for the Welfare of Mankind, incomparably the greater part of whom are but in a low and mean condition, and expoſed to ſuch frequent Streights and Difficulties, as not to allow them to conſult their own Preſervation, though at the coſt of ſuch as have not the like occaſion for what is thus taken from them. And as for any other ſort of Robbery he is no way concerned about it, nor can any one pretend he is. This is a Plea exactly parallel to Mr. *H*'s. And yet as it would not ſave the Neck of him that robs only with this *Prudence* and *Caution*, if once convict of having done it; ſo I dare be bold to ſay, if Mr. *H.* himſelf were his Caſuiſt, he would not undertake to aſſure him, that it will ſtand him in any ſtead at the laſt Day, when he ſhall come to appear before our Lord's Tribunal. Let him then compare this way of arguing with his own; and give any tolerable Reaſon, why his ſhould be thought to be of force, whilſt this is of none.

Mr. *H.* adds, *What is here ſaid concerning Slaves, cannot be proved to hold good in reſpect to hired Servants.* Whereto I anſwer, That it is very eaſily proved, οἰκέται, the Word here uſed by the Apoſtle, being of a larger Extent than Mr. *H.* ſuppoſes. So (*a*) *Suidas* teaches, and (*b*) *Heſychius*,

D

(*a*) Οἰκέται ὁ μόνον δεδάποντες, ἀλλα καὶ πάντες οἱ κατ' ἀυλίαν.

(*b*) Οἰκέται οἱ κατ' οἶκον πάντες.

sychius, and *(a) Julius Pollux*, and *(b) H. Stevens*, and *(c) Phavorinus* and *(d)* other Lexicographers, and Gloſſariſts. And accordingly in the New Teſtament, δυο τῶν οἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ, *Acts* 10. 7. is rendered *two of his houſhold Servants*, not only in our Verſion, but in that *(e)* of the vulgar Latine, and the *(f)* Tranſlation from the *Arabick*, and to the ſame ſenſe *(g)* in that from the *Ethiopick*. In ſhort, I take this Word to be always underſtood to import not Slaves only, but the reſt of the Family, and conſequently all the hired Servants that are among them. Nor can it be ſaid, thoſe to whom this Epiſtle was written had no ſuch: For it is directed *(h) to the diſperſed*, *(i)* that is to the ſcattered *Jews*, that were in *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Aſia*, (the *(k)* leſſer *Aſia*, or rather one particular part of it) and *Bithynia*. And that the *Jews* had of old hired Servants, is proved from divers *(l)* places in the Old Teſtament, where they are expreſly mentioned, and diſtinguiſhed from thoſe who were *bought with Money*, and ſo were their proper Goods. And the difference between the Duty of hired Servants and Slaves in this point, I take to

---

(a) Οἰκέτης, domeſticus, οἰκέτις, domeſtica. *l.* 3. *ſegm.* 74.

(b) Οἰκέτης, domeſticus, ex Ariſtoph. Nub. οἱ δὲ οἰκέται ξύγκεισιν, omnes domeſtici, tota familia.

(c) Οἰκέται, οἱ κατὰ τὴν οἰκίαν πάντες.

(d) Who render οἰκέτης, *by* Domeſticus, *as well as* Servus.

(e) Duobus famulis ſuis. *(f)* Duobus è famulis ſuis.

(g) Duobus militibus ex hominibus domûs ejus.

(h) ch. 1. 1.

(i) Judæis ſcilicet, nam illis præcipuè deſtinatus erat Petrus. *Grot.* in loc. διασπορᾶς, ſic vocantur, loci omnes in quibus Iſraelitæ extra patriam vivebant, quocunq; tempore, quacunq; occaſione, &c. ibid. *To the Jews that have received the Faith, and are diſperſed and ſojourn in* Pontus, &c. *Dr.* Hammond on the words. *It was written to the* Jews, *diſperſed through* Pontus, Galatia, &c. *Dr.* Whitby.

(k) Ioniæ, in quâ Epheſus. In quâ regione plurimi Judæi. *Joſephus* XII. 3. XIV. 17. in Dolabellæ edicto, & XVI. 3. ubi in Ioniæ urbibus ingentem ait fuiſſe Judæorum multitudinem. *Grot.* in loc.

(l) Exod. 12. 45. Levit. 25. 6, 39, 40, 53. Deut. 24. 14.

to be no more than that they might have such legal Remedies, against their mercileſs and tyrannical Maſters, as the others had not, and were to ſerve only according to their Covenant; and when the time covenanted for ſhould be expired, they were at liberty to depart, which the other were never to do, unleſs manumitted by them. But whilſt they continued Servants, they were both of them to be faithful, and ſubmiſſive to their Maſters, though froward and very uneaſy to them. Moſt certainly neither of them, how hardly ſoever uſed, might upon any Pretence turn their Maſters out of Doors, and ſeize upon their Inheritance; as Mr. *H.* would have it done to wicked and tyrannical Princes.

But Mr. *H.* *(a)* denies Subjects ordinarily ſpeaking to be Slaves; and thence concludes them not obliged to that patient Submiſſion, and Non-reſiſtance, which is required of Slaves. In anſwer whereto I ſhall not ſtand to convince him, how arbitrary and deſpotical ſeveral Kings have been, and ſome in the World yet are, and what great Slaves their Subjects are to them by their Conſtitution; but rather ſhall deſire him to conſider that a ſovereign Prince, where not ſo abſolute, is yet more eminently *the Miniſter of God*, than any Maſter whatſoever; and ſo acting by a more ſacred Authority, has a Right to a compleater Subjection of thoſe over whom he is ſet, than any Maſter can pretend to. He might alſo farther remember, the Obligations Subjects are under, upon account of the Oaths taken by them to their Sovereign. Which I hope he will not deny, to lay a far more powerful Tye upon them, to perform the Allegiance ſo promiſed and engaged for, than any that does, or can lie upon Slaves from the Right their Maſters have over them. Nor can a Subject who has abjured all Reſiſtance, be more at liberty to make uſe of it, upon whatever Provocation, than the mereſt Slave that ever was. According to Mr. *H's.* own Caſuiſtry, *(b)* *It is indeed praiſe-worthy in a private Perſon to ſuffer patiently, and contentedly, when ſuch ſuffering*

 cannot

(a) P. 129. *(b)* P. 130.

cannot poſſibly, or honourably, be avoided; as it certainly cannot when attended with the breach of our ſworn as well as natural Allegiance. And I preſume he will not deny Perjury and Rebellion to be at leaſt as criminal in greater and more publick Perſons, as in any the meaneſt and moſt obſcure Subject.

I own, if we take Mr. *H*'s word for it, *the only Debate that can concern a* Chriſtian *upon S.* Peter's *reaſoning, will be this, Whether of the two is more glorious and praiſe-worthy, to labour and ſuffer in maintaining the Cauſe of a* Nation's Rights and Liberties, *or in ſuch a* ſubmiſſion *as betrays them for ever, into the Hands of* Violence *and* Ambition. But then I muſt beg Mr. *H*'s pardon, if I take leave to affirm on the contrary, that this is not a true ſtate of the Queſtion; and that if we attend to S. *Peter* himſelf, we ſhall quickly ſee that upon his Reaſoning, *the only Debate that can concern a Chriſtian will be, Whether of the two is more glorious and praiſe-worthy*, to ſuffer quietly and patiently under evil Governors, *for the Lord's ſake, and that* after this manner, *by well doing we may put to ſilence the Ignorance of fooliſh men*, or for the prevention of any temporal Evils, that might befal either ourſelves or others, to ſhew ourſelves diſobedient to Authority in contradiction to the Apoſtle's expreſs Injunction to be Subject and not Reſiſt. And this is a Caſe requires no depth of thought, nor any time for conſideration, nor indeed any thing elſe but a little Honeſty, and a ſmall acquaintance with the nature of our moſt Holy Religion to determine it.

Thus I have ſhewn how poſitive the holy Scripture is, againſt all Reſiſtance of the ſupreme Authority, in whomſoever it reſides, or how groſly ſoever abuſed to God's diſhonour, and the Subjects peril and detriment. I have alſo conſidered the oppoſite Doctrine of Mr. *H.* and how far all he has ſaid is from invalidating the Directions given in Scripture, for Patience and Submiſſion under the worſt of Governors. And now upon a brief compariſon, I leave it to the Reader ſeriouſly, and as he will anſwer it at the laſt Day, to determine whether of theſe Guides he will adhere to, the holy Scripture,

or

or Mr. *H*'s. *Measures of Submission*, it being as impossible to follow both, as it is to *serve God and Mammon*. The Scripture teaches *to fear God and the King*, to own his Authority as from above, *to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to submit to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake* and *for silencing the Ignorance of foolish Men, to pray for Kings and all in Authority, and not to revile or curse them*, though ever so privately; to honour and obey them, and not *to take up the Sword* against them, or *resist* them upon pain of *Damnation*. Mr. *H.* teaches that *it is Honourable and Glorious to Resist a bad Governor*, from whom the People at any time apprehend themselves in danger of being, or perhaps already feel themselves, very ill used, or even though he only *deflect from the Will of God, and do not continually attend upon* the promotion of the Publick Welfare and Happiness. This he may call *following S. Paul* and the rest of the sacred Writers; but the best of it is, every one is not bound to believe or follow him, when he says so. For after all his expounding, and wresting, and misinterpreting, it is still undeniable that Cursing of Kings is not *Praying* for them, Opposing them is not *Honouring* them, Taking Arms against them is not *Submitting* to them, Resistance is not *Obedience*.

CHAP. II.

Whether Mr. H's. *Doctrine of Resistance be agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians?*

HAving thus far shewn the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, and how full they are against all Resistance of Authority, I propounded next to enquire, into the Sentiments of the Primitive Christians in this respect. Not as if what is taught in Scripture were not of it self sufficiently obligatory, to all that profess themselves our Lord's Disciples, and hope to be

ſaved by him ; but becauſe theſe were the beſt Expoſitors of the meaning of thoſe ſacred Writings, as who might well be ſuppoſed to underſtand, what was delivered by our bleſſed Saviour and his Apoſtles, if any whoſoever ever did. They were likewiſe of ſuch unſpotted Integrity, and ſo ſincere and upright in all their Proceedings, that we may ſafely reſt aſſured they would ſtrictly adhere to, what they apprehended to be the Will and true Intent of our bleſſed Lord. And hence it follows on the contrary, that to introduce a Doctrine contrary to theirs, and a Practice no way ſuiting with what was obſervable in them, muſt be to attempt the Subverſion of our moſt Holy Religion, ſo far as this Variation extends. And whether this be not the Caſe of Mr. *H.* in relation to our preſent Debate, I come now to conſider.

Mr. *H.* I confeſs diſcards them as no proper Judges in the Caſe, but for no other reaſon ſave only becauſe they are not of his ſide. He ſees they are undeniably againſt him, and therefore thinks it neceſſary to be againſt them. But this all muſt allow to be no commendation of his Syſtem, but a great diſparagement to it, and an invincible Argument againſt it. Never was our moſt Holy Religion ſo exactly deſcribed in the Lives of its Profeſſors, as in theirs who lived in the firſt Ages of it, and a great part of whom died Martyrs for it. Theſe ſhewed forth the lively Senſe they had of our Redeemer's infinite Love to Mankind, and of the Redemption he had wrought out for them, and the Hope he had ſet before them, and the Precepts he had given them in charge; and thought they could never do or ſuffer too much for Him, who had humbled himſelf in ſo ſtupendous a manner for them, to reſcue them out of the Jaws of everlaſting Deſtruction, and procure them a Title to a heavenly Inheritance. They looked upon themſelves as Strangers and Sojourners upon Earth, and whoſe great Buſineſs it was to make ſure of a better Eſtate, againſt they ſhould be taken hence. And accordingly their Minds were fixed upon the *things above*; and their conſtant Study was to be conformed to their

Bleſſed

Bleſſed Lord's Example, and to fulfil all his Commands to the beſt of their power. And well knowing Obedience to thoſe in Authority, to be one neceſſary Branch of their Religion, they were far more ſollicitous to acquit themſelves aright in this reſpect, than to ſecure a temporal ſtate of Peace and Proſperity in this World. They were of a ſubmiſſive, paſſive Temper, little concerned for the Body, or the things of it, but very deſirous to be eternally ſaved, whatſoever might become of them in the mean time. They thought it far better, both ſafer for themſelves, and more for God's Glory, and the Honour and Advancement of their Religion, to lay down their Lives for it, than either live, or dye Rebels againſt their lawful, though otherwiſe unjuſt, tyrannical, and perſecuting Emperors; and ſo have left us an Example highly deſerving our moſt ſerious Imitation. As I ſhall endeavour to prove, by anſwering theſe four following Enquiries.

I. What was the Doctrine of theſe ancient and moſt exemplary Chriſtians, concerning Obedience to Governors.

II. What their Practice was in this reſpect.

III. What Obligation we are under to the imitation of them.

IV. What Mr. *H.* has offered to the contrary, and to how little purpoſe. The conſideration of which Particulars will be a powerful Argument for convincing the ſerious and impartial Reader, how ill the Doctrine of Reſiſtance becomes a Preacher of the Goſpel, and how cautious all Chriſtians ought to be, and how averſe to giving ear to it. To theſe therefore I now apply my ſelf in the four following Sections.

SECT. I.

What the Doctrine of the Primitive Chriſtians was as to the Duty of Obedience to Governors.

A Very little Enquiry will ſuffice to inform us beyond all doubt, that theſe truly pious and exemplary

Professors of our Religion were clearly against all Resistance of Authority, in whomsoever it resided, or how ill soever managed or abused. They never called to Arm upon any the greatest Provocation, though none ever met with more than they did, none having been worse used by their enraged Princes than they were, nor any in the World having ever deserved it less. The Cruelties, Tortures, Deaths they conflicted with from time to time, were enough to put them beyond all patience, had it not been for the wonderful influence their Religion had upon their Souls, and the powerful supernatural Assistance that was administred them from on high. No Barbarities were thought too hard to be executed upon these holy, inoffensive Followers of our Lord, nor any the slightest Pretence too little to give occasion for them. And yet it is easy to observe, how all the while they breathed forth nothing but Patience and Submission, and a ready compliance with whatsoever God in his good Providence should see fit to lay upon them. They taught Obedience, an active Obedience, to their Sovereigns in all things lawful, and a passive Subjection and Suffering in other cases, and never to Rebel, or list themselves in their own Defence against Authority, how inhumanly soever abused to their Destruction, nor even to break forth into any irreverent and indecent Expressions, against their tyrannical Superiours.

The Constitutions called *Apostolical* direct, *(a) To fear the King, as God's Institution and Ordinance.* And the Canons so called enjoin, *(b) Not to revile the King or Ruler, as being against all Law and Justice; and order* that such *of the Clergy* as should presume to do it *should be deposed; and a Layman to be excommunicated.* Which Canon the Commentators upon it declare, to have forbidden all Reviling and undutiful Reproaching the sovereign Prince, though not all Reprehension of him for

(a) Τὸν Βασιλέα φοβηθήσῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι τῆ κυρίᾳ ἐστὶν ἡ χειροτονία. l. 7. c. 17.

(b) Ὅσις ὑβρίσει βασιλέα ἢ ἄρχοντα παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον, τιμωρίαν τινύτω· καὶ εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς, καθαιρείσθω, εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφορίζεσθω. Can. 84.

for his Faults. The like Judgment concerning it, the learned Biſhop *Beveridge* alſo notes to have been given by *Harmenopulus*, and that S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Chryſoſtom* practiſed accordingly. And if the Compilers of theſe Canons would not admit of an indecent Treatment of their Governors in Words, it is a natural inference, that they would much leſs have allowed to take up Arms againſt them. And that this was the Opinion and Doctrine of thoſe purer Times is too plain for any one to queſtion it, who has but in any tolerable degree been converſant in their Writings, and has read them with any ſort of attention and impartiality.

We have little left of the Writings of the firſt Century, and the Chriſtian Church being then in its infancy, and its Members few comparatively to what were afterwards, it is no wonder if we meet with no Inſtances of any that were then in circumſtances to have reſiſted, if they would; though withal, from what they had been ſo lately taught, it is eaſy to believe, they would by no means have done it, if they could. It is evident as to S. *Ignatius*, a Diſciple of the Apoſtles, and (*a*) who had familiarly converſed with them, who lived in this Century, and ſuffered Martyrdom in the beginning of the next, that he bare all the ill Uſage that befel him, with an undaunted Courage and Reſignation to the Divine Will, and without endeavouring to incenſe any againſt thoſe who were the Authors or Promoters of his Death.

And which is more full to the purpoſe we are upon, in this ſecond Century *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Apology to *Antoninus Pius* and his Sons, teſtifies of the Chriſtians, that they were the beſt of all their Subjects; in that (*b*) *they were the forwardeſt of all to pay their Tributes and Cuſtoms, and though they worſhiped God only, they were obedient to them in all things elſe, Praying for them, that together with their Royal Power, they might enjoy a ſound Mind*;

(*a*) Σωιζόμενο τοῖς ἀποστόλοις γνησίως. *B.* Chryſoſt. εἰς τ' ἅγιον Ἰγνάτιον.

(*b*) *Apol.* 2. p. 64.

Mind; admonishing them withal of the ill consequence *of neglecting their Christian Subjects, and taking* no care of them *whilst they thus prayed for them, and dealt so openly and plainly with them*; not threatning them with any Opposition or Resistance upon the account of their ill Government, as Mr. *H.* would have done, but only putting them in mind *of the Account of their Power, that must be given to Almighty God at the last Day, and the eternal Fire wherein they must expect to be punished for their Abuse of it.* So his Contemporary *Athenagoras* tells *Antoninus* and his Son *Commodus*, That the Christians (*a*) *prayed for the Empire, that the Son might succeed to his Father's Throne, as was most just, and that their Dominion might be extended far and near, that under these Governors themselves might live quietly and peaceably, and as became dutiful and obedient Subjects.* In like manner *Theophilus* of *Antioch* profes'd, (*b*) *He would not worship the Emperor any more than the Heathen Gods, but yet he would be sure to pray for him, as knowing him to be constituted by God, not to have religious Worship, but to have all lawful Honour paid him.* And a little after (*c*) says he, *Honour the King, honour him, and shew thyself well affected towards him, being subject to him and praying for him, for so doing thou performest the Will of God, whose Law commands to honour God and the King, and disobey neither of them.* Where it is observable he has no more reservation for Resisting the King, than for Resisting God himself. For he requires, according to the Translation of the Seventy, (*d*) *to be disobedient to neither of them.* About the same time with him lived *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*, a Disciple of S. *John*. And he, when the Proconsul would have perswaded him to renounce Christ, and swear by *Cesar*'s Fortune or *Genius*, threatning him with the Beasts and the Fire upon his non-compliance, resolutely answered, (*e*) *He was a Christian, and was ready to justify such his Profession, if he might but be allowed a day for it*; adding however, to shew the

(*a*) Legat. pro Christianis. *p.* 39, 40. (*p.* 163. *Edit. Ox.* 1682.)
(*b*) Ad Autol. *l.* 1. *p.* 76. (*p.* 30. *Ed. Ox.*) (*c*) *P.* 77. (*p.* 33. *Ed. Ox.* 1684.)
(*d*) Μήθ' ἑτέρων αὐτῶν ἀπειθῆσαι. Prov. 24. 21.
(*e*) Eccl. *Smyrn.* Epist. de S. *Polycarpi* Martyrio. *Sect.* X.

the deference both himself and his Fellow-christians bare to Authority, that (*a*) *they had learned to pay, as was most proper, all the Honour to Powers and Rulers, that they could with safety to themselves*, that is to say, (*b*) without endangering the loss of their Souls, for here is no mention at all of any regard had to their temporal Welfare, as I shall observe more particularly in its proper place; giving moreover this Caution to the Proconsul, (*c*) πῦρ ἀπειλεῖς, &c. *Thou threatenest me with Fire that will burn but for a short time, before it be extinguished, but art not aware of that Fire whereto the wicked shall be condemned at the last Judgment, and which is reserved for their eternal Punishment.* Thus he puts the Proconsul in mind of the dreadful Vengeance, whereto he was like to expose himself from Almighty God in the other World; but gives not the least hint of any Correction or Opposition he was to expect from his Subjects here in this.

In the latter part of this Age *Irenæus* was Bishop of *Lyons*, and he taught that (*d*) *the Word saith by* Solomon, *By me Kings reign, and the powerful hold*, or decree *Justice; by me Princes are exalted, and by me Tyrants govern the Earth; and the Apostle* Paul *says this, Be subject to all the higher Powers*, (without exception of the bad, and for this reason, which extends equally to all,) *for there is no Power but of God, and those that be, are ordained of God. And forasmuch as he speaks not of the Angelical Powers, or of invisible Princes, but of human Powers; he says, for this reason ye pay Tribute, for they are the Ministers of God, attending on this very thing, which the Lord also himself confirmed, by commanding to pay the Collectors of Tribute, both for himself and for* Peter; *because*, as was said, *they are the Ministers of God serving to this very purpose. For seeing Man, upon his departure from God, became so brutish, as to take even his nearest Kindred for Enemies, and*

(*a*) Eccl. *Smyrn.* Epist. de S. *Polycarpi* Martyrio. *Sect.* X.

(*b*) Magistratibus enim & Potestatibus à Deo constitutis eum honorem, qui nostrorum animorum saluti nostræque religioni nihil afferat detrimenti, pro dignitate tribuere docemur. *As* Christopherson *renders the Words in* Eusebius Hist. Eccl. *l.* 4. *c.* 15. (*c*) *Sect.* XI. (*d*) *L.* 5. *c.* 24.

and to live under no Obedience, in all Disorder, and Murder, and Covetousness; God has imposed upon him the fear of a Man, that being subject to the Power of Men, and being bound by their Law, they may have some Justice done them, and may be governed one by another, fearing the Sword they see is held over them, as the Apostle saith, For he beareth not the Sword in vain, for he is the Minister of God, an Avenger for Wrath to him that doth Evil. *And for this reason, the Magistrates having the Laws for their Direction, shall never be accountable or suffer for what they do justly. But when they act wickedly, contrary both to Law and Justice, and like Tyrants, not Kings, they shall perish by the just Judgment of God, which reaches equally to all, and spares none.* And a little after, *By whose Command Men are born, by his Command also are Kings ordained, as suits the Circumstances of those over whom they are set; some for the Amendment and Benefit of their Subjects, and the Preservation of Justice; and some for Fear, and Punishment, and Reproof, and some again for Contempt, and Reproach, and Pride, as the People shall have deserved; the just Judgment of God reaching, as we have already said, equally to all.* Thus this famous Bishop and Martyr presses Obedience to Princes, from the same Considerations with the Apostle, requiring to be subject to them as God's Ordinance, and not to rise up against them for their own defence, but to leave it to God to punish them when they *deflect from their Duty*, and *impiously and unrighteously* seek the Ruin, rather than the Welfare and Happiness of the Society.

In the latter part of the second Century, and beginning of the third, lived *Tertullian*; who in his noble Apology for the Christians, and his Address to *Scapula* the Proconsul of *Africk*, presses the Duty of Obedience, when at the same time he declares they could easily have taken a different course with their persecuting Princes, if their Religion had not tied up their hands; as I shall have occasion to shew in the next Section. At present I observe from him, that (*b*) *the Emperors received*

(*b*) *Apol.* c. 30.

ved their Authority from God, and had no Power above them but his; that they were Seconds to him, and the First that were after him; were above all Men living, and therefore great because only less than Heaven, being made Emperors by him, who made them Men before they were Emperors. A plain acknowledgment that they received their Commission from God, and being subject to him only, must therefore be accountable to none of their Subjects, but to him alone. Again says he, (*c*) *We reverence the Ordinance of God in the Emperors, their Authority being committed to them by him.* And again, (*d*) *We cannot but reverence the Emperor, as one whom our God has made choice of; and I may justly say,* Cæsar *is ours rather than yours, being set in that Station by our God.* And not long after, complaining of the disaffection and undutifulness of other Subjects to the Emperor, in wishing secretly for fresh *Cæsars* one after another, for their own private Advantage, and this even when they made open profession of praying for just the contrary; (*e*) *A Christian,* says he, *can no more say as those do, than he can wish for a new* Cæsar, namely, in order to the partaking of the largesses that were given upon such Occasions. He also invites his fellow-Christians to bear patiently all the Trials and difficulties it should seem good to God to bring them into. (*f*) *Absit ab hâc sectâ,* &c. says he, *Far be it from the Professors of our most holy Religion, to revenge themselves by Fire,* (and the case is the same as to Arms) *or to be disturbed at the Suffering of whatever God has order'd for the proof of their Fidelity;* after this manner referring them to God, the Author of all they endured, and not to the Instrument employed under him, putting them in mind with what Calmness and Serenity, what Contentment and Submission they ought to bear it, and that they were not to endeavour to shake off their Yoke, till he should be graciously pleased to ease them of it. And in the same Apology, speaking of *Hippias,* who was *slain whilst actually engaged in a design upon his City,* he subjoins, (*g*) It was *such a Design as no Christian ever was con-*

(*c*) *Apol.* c. 32. (*d*) C. 33. (*e*) C. 35. (*f*) C. 37. (*g*) C. 46.

concerned in for the Deliverance of his Brethren, though when under the Preſſure of the utmoſt Inhumanity. From which memorable Words, the learned Mr. *Reeves* has made this juſt Obſervation, and highly pertinent and uſeful to my preſent purpoſe. (*b*) *That which I think moſt remarkable in this Compariſon between a Philoſopher and a Chriſtian, is, that he concludes the whole with the Inſtance of Rebellion in* Hippias, a thing, *ſays he*, which no Chriſtian was ever heard to have attempted for the Reſcue of his Brethren, tho' under the moſt provoking and barbarous Uſage. *This upon all occaſions he ſhews to be the diſtinguiſhing Character of Chriſtians; this he triumphs upon, and therefore concludes the period with Non-reſiſtance, like an Orator who gradually riſes higher and higher, and clinches all with that he thinks moſt likely to leave the deepeſt Impreſſion.* But I return to *Tertullian* himſelf, who makes this Profeſſion in behalf of the Chriſtian Subjects of the Empire, (*a*) *We ſacrifice for the ſafety of the Emperor, but to our God and his, and as we are commanded, with unfeigned Prayer.* He had likewiſe ſaid juſt before, *A Chriſtian is no man's Enemy, not only not the Emperor's, whom knowing to be of God's appointment, he muſt needs love him, and reverence and honour him, and deſire his Safety, and that of his Empire, that it may continue, as it will, to the end of the World. Wherefore we worſhip the Emperor, as far as is permitted us, or is Expedient for him, as a Man who is next under God, and has received all his Power from God, and is leſs than God only, and thus is above all others, and inferiour to none but the True God.* And now will Mr. *H.* ſay all this is ſpoken, like one that wanted to get rid of his Sovereign, and was perſuaded he ought to be laid aſide, whenſoever he ſhould neglect his Duty, or at leaſt when he ſhould preſume to act contrary to the End of his Inſtitution? But I proceed.

Not long after, in the third Century, *Origen* ſpeaks likewiſe to the ſame purpoſe. For *Celſus* having objected to the Chriſtians, that their Religion had its firſt riſe from a ſeditious Oppoſition to the *Jews*, whom they had

(*b*) In loc. (*a*) Ad Scapul. *c.* 2.

had hereupon taken occasion to desert, and to set themselves against them; he replies, That (*a*) *it was impossible to tell of any seditious Insurrection the Christians had ever been guilty of; and that had they ever risen, as is here pretended, against the Jews, their Lawgiver would never have forbidden all Murder, nor would his Disciples, had they had their first beginning from a Rebellion, have admitted of such gentler Laws, as should expose them to be led like Sheep to the slaughter, without ever daring to revenge themselves upon their Persecutors.* Than which, what could be more directly opposite to Mr. *H*'s. Doctrine of Resistance? And at another time he gives this Character of them, (*b*) That *they refused not to dye for their Integrity.* And that (*c*) *they knew no way of departing out of this Life more worthily, than by laying it down for the sake of Virtue and Religion, whensoever this condition was imposed by those Magistrates, or Judges, who reckon'd themselves to have the Power over their Lives, that either they must dye for their Obedience to their Lord's Commands, or save their Lives by acting contrary to his Laws.* Whereby it appears the Christians were then of such an humble Passive Temper, that they might with as much shew of reason be charged with Robbery, or Perjury, or Idolatry, or any other the most heinous Crimes, as with either actually Resisting, or so much as once pretending it Lawful, not to say *Honourable and Glorious*, to resist their lawful Sovereign, though ever so bitter an Enemy to, and Persecutor of themselves, and their Religion. And I am very apt to think that no one who had read these Words in *Origen*, would have in the least suspected, that Mr. *H.* would ever have undertaken to represent him as an Advocate for that Resistance he so evidently disavows.

So his Contemporary S. *Cyprian* proclaims of the Christians of those days, (*d*) That *their Enemies repulsed by their Faith and Courage found plainly, they had resolved to dye rather than suffer themselves to be overcome, nor would so much as once resist those who set upon them,*

not

(*a*) *C. Celf. l. 3. p. 115.* (*b*) *L. 8. p. 414.* (*c*) *Ibid.* (*d*) *Ep. 60.*

not accounting it consistent with their Duty to destroy those by whom they thus innocently suffered, but that they were rather freely to expose their dearest Hearts Blood, whereby to obtain the quicker Deliverance from the insatiable Malice and Cruelty of their outrageous Adversaries. And even those who had unhappily fallen through surprize or fear, no sooner recovered themselves, but they presently confessed their Guilt, and fortified themselves with Courage and Patience, and stood immovable, in hope of obtaining not only a Pardon for their Fault, but a Crown of Glory by their Sufferings. Where it is observable, that this devout Martyr breaths forth nothing, but an Obligation to be ready upon all occasions, to suffer for the Name of Christ, who had done and suffered so much for them; not one word of standing up for the Publick Safety and Welfare, and to preserve themselves and their Posterity from temporal Ruin. No, all his Aim was to recommend to them a Concern and Care for a better State, and a patient Suffering whatever was necessary in order to it. And again in the same Epistle says he, *Let us offer up our daily Groans, and repeated Prayers; for these* (not the Arm of Flesh) *are our heavenly Weapons and the Divine Darts that protect us.* And in another (*a*) Epistle, written to the Presbyters, and Deacons, and the whole Body of his Church, when upon the Proconsul's sending to seize him at *Utica*, he had been advised to withdraw himself, that he might glorify God by *suffering in his own City, and in the face of his Flock*, having declared his Expectation in this his Retirement, that the Proconsul would come to *Carthage*, and there he should *hear from him, what the Emperors had decreed concerning the Christians, both Clergy and Laity*, and being resolved then *freely to speak his Mind, as the Lord should direct him*, he gives this Advice, *Vos autem fratres carissimi*, &c. As to you *my most dear Brethren, be sure to keep in mind the Doctrine I have always taught you, concerning our Lord's Commands, and as I have in my Preaching continually instructed you, so be ye sure to study, how to live quietly and peaceably, and let none of*

(*a*) *Ep.* 81.

of you raiſe any Tumult amongſt the Brethren. And at another time, having taken occaſion (*a*) ſadly to bewail the loſs of ſuch as had fallen in the *Decian* Perſecution, lamenting it in the ſorrowfulleſt manner with Sighs and Tears, he is yet ſo far from exciting to have an eye at the temporal Good of the Community, and powerfully and valiantly *Reſiſt* the Emperor, whereby to prevent the like Inſults and Outrages for the future, that he makes no other uſe of it, but to invite to a ſerious Reflection upon ſo great a Misfortune, together with the unhappy Cauſe of it, and puts them in mind that their Sins had juſtly deſerved all that had befallen them, and much more than Almighty God had yet ſeen fit to lay upon them; and they ought therefore to look upon what they had been called to ſuffer, (*b*) *rather as a Tryal of their Faith, than a Perſecution for it.* Then he proceeds to expoſe the Heinouſneſs of their Sin, and eſpecially of theirs who took upon them to betray others into it, enquiring into the Cauſes of it, and ſhewing how unreaſonable it was, that either the loſs of their Eſtates, or the fear of whatſoever Cruelties might be executed upon them, ſhould rob them of their Integrity, admoniſhing them moreover of the Divine (*c*) Judgments that have frequently befallen Apoſtacy, even in this Life, beſides the everlaſting Vengeance denounced againſt them, and to be inflicted upon them in the next; preſſing (*d*) them to a Repentance, and a return from the doleful State whereinto they were fallen; (*e*) offering to pray to God for them, and urging them to uſe their Endeavours for capacitating themſelves to receive Abſolution, begging that both he and they might join together

E

(*a*) De lapſis, *p.* 123.

(*b*) Ut hoc omne quod geſtum eſt, exploratio potius quam perſecutio videretur.

(*c*) Ecce eorum qui negaverant quæ ſupplicia conſpicimus? quos eorum triſtes exitus flemus? Nec hîc eſſe ſine pœnâ poſſunt, quamvis necdum dies venerit pœnæ.

(*d*) Quæſo vos fratres, acquieſcite ſalubribus remediis: conſiliis obedite melioribus, *&c.*

(*e*) Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare poſſimus, *&c.*

gether in united Groans and Tears, and that in order thereto, having fallen in so dreadful a manner, they would shew an answerable sorrow for it, that (*a*) the measure of their Repentance might be proportioned to the degree of their Sin; that so deep a Wound might have a suitable Medicine, and a long and deep Humiliation, (*b*) to pass the Day in Mourning, and the Night in Watching and Weeping, (*c*) to lie upon the Ground in Ashes and Haircloath and Nastiness, (*d*) Fasting, and Praying and doing good Works. This is the only Advice S. *Cyprian* gives in those Trying Times, and to such as were sensible how great Temptations they had met with from the Malice of their Persecutors. And if Mr. *H.* can reconcile this with his *Hypothesis*, or can infer any thing from hence in favour of that (*e*) *Resistance which he has taught to be lawful*, I shall ever own him a Man of singular Ingenuity.

Agreeably hereto (*f*) *Eusebius* relates the Martyrdom of *Marinus* at *Cæsarea*, about the same time. Which though the Death of a single Person, is yet particularly remarkable upon two accounts; that is to say, upon the account of his own Circumstances and Profession, as being a great Man amongst the Souldiery, and upon account of the Advice and Encouragement given him by *Theotecnus* the Bishop of the place, and who must be supposed to have well understood the Doctrine of those Times in point of Obedience to Governors. He was of an honourable Family, and very rich, and of great Note, and made a very considerable Figure in the Army. But being about to be advanced to yet a higher Station, that of course belonged to him, another who aim'd

(*a*) Quam magna deliquimus, tam granditer defleamus. Alto vulneri diligens & longa medicina non desit; pœnitentia crimine minor non sit.

(*b*) Diem luctu transigere, vigiliis noctes ac fletibus ducere.

(*c*) Stratos solo adhærere cineri, in cilicio & sordibus voluptari.

(*d*) Post diaboli cibum malle jejunium: justis operibus incumbere, *&c.*

(*e*) *P.* 64. (*f*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 15.

aim'd at the ſame Promotion, and had no other Plea for himſelf, charged *Marinus* with being a Chriſtian, and that he had not ſacrificed to the Emperors, and was therefore according to the ſtanding Laws of the Empire, unqualified for ſuch a Command; and ſo got him adjudged to death, unleſs he would renounce his Chriſtianity within the ſpace of three hours. Which coming to the knowledge of *Theotecnus*, he preſently ſought a liberty of diſcourſing *Marinus*, and taking him by the hand carried him ſtraightway into the Choir of the Church, and placed him by the (*a*) Altar, and there pointing on the one hand to his Sword, the token of his Employment, on the other he held out the Holy Bible before him, not to encourage him, as Mr. *H.* would have done, to fight for the Bible, and himſelf, and his Fellow-Chriſtians, eſpecially conſidering his Station and Intereſt in the Army, and the Aſſiſtance he might thence have expected, upon ſuch a weighty Occaſion; but on the contrary that he might adviſe him ſeriouſly and deliberately to determin with himſelf, whether he would reſolve to ſtick to, his Preferment or his Chriſtianity, not ſo much as in the leaſt intimating, or ſuppoſing any other way left him, whereby to take care of himſelf; perſuading him to hold faſt his Bible, and never depart from his God; aſſuring him that ſo he ſhould dye in Peace, and obtain the Crown of Martyrdom, which he knew to be of infinitely greater Concern to him, than his temporal Safety and Welfare. This was the courſe that good and zealous Biſhop recommended, encouraged, and urged him to; and which *Marinus*, like an unfeigned Diſciple of the Bleſſed *Jeſus*, followed accordingly. And he ſoon found the bleſſed Effect of it.

Much about the ſame time, *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, told *Æmilian* the Prefect of *Egypt*, endeavouring to draw him and his Brethren from the Faith, That (*b*) *they worſhipped one only God, the Maker of all things, the ſame that gave the Kingdom to the moſt holy Emperors* Valerian *and* Gallienus; *and that they inceſſantly prayed to*

E 2 *him*,

(*a*) Ἁγίασμα. (*b*) *Euſeb.* Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 11.

him, for the Stability and Safety of the Empire. And in an Epiſtle to *Domitius*, and *Didymus*, (*a*) he complains, *That the Chriſtians, Men and Women, young and old of both Sexes, Souldiers and private Perſons, of all Conditions and all Ages, were whipt to Death, were burnt in the Fire, were ſlain with the Sword*; yet never in the leaſt intimates any inclination in them, to ſtand up in their own Defence, againſt ſuch as treated them thus barbarouſly. There were no Mr. *H's.* amongſt the Chriſtians of thoſe days, to ſtir them up to Reſiſt their Prince; but they conſidered rather that all their Sufferings were in order to a Crown of Glory, which they moſt earneſtly deſired to attain to.

Conſonantly whereto in the next Age, *Lactantius* ſpeaking of Religion, teaches, That (*b*) *it is to be defended, not by Fighting, but by Dying for it; not by Cruelty, but by Patience; not by Wickedneſs, but by Truſt in God, and Reliance upon him; the former being the way of Bad, the other of Good Men.* And ſoon after, (*c*) *When we ſuffer ſo dreadfully, we do not ſo much as return ill Language for it, but leave it to God to avenge our Sufferings.*

So *Gregory Nazianzen* having complained of the ill Deſigns of the Apoſtate *Julian* againſt the Chriſtians, and that he had not only renounced their Religion, but had ſet himſelf by all means poſſible to deſtroy and extirpate it, inſomuch that (*d*) neither *Diocleſian*, who, as he expreſſes it, (*e*) *firſt ſet himſelf to reproach the Chriſtians, nor* Maximinian, *who came after, and exceeded him, had ever thought of, nor* Maximin, *more cruel and barbarous than either of theſe*; he ſubjoins, *Theſe things he had been contriving with himſelf, as ſome of his moſt intimate Confidents have owned*; ἐπῃρέθη δε, *but he was prevented by the Favour of God, and the Tears of the Chriſtians plentifully ſhed upon this occaſion,* τοῦτο μόνον ἐγχόντων κατὰ τῶν διώκλε φάρμακον, *this being the only Remedy they were allowed againſt the*

(*a*) *Euſeb.* Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 11.
(*b*) Inſtit. *l.* 5. *c.* 20. (*c*) *C.* 21.
(*d*) Στηλιτευτ. *a. p.* 57.
(*e*) Πρῶτος ἐγὼ πάντων ἤρξάντων, ἀλλὰ πρῶτος ἦν ἐν ἐκείνῳ διωγμῷ. *&c.* Schol. in loc.

the Perſecutor. And at another time, he exhorts (*a*) *to continue faithful to Kings, but eſpecially to Almighty God, and for his ſake,* (not only for the ſake of Publick Good) *to ſuch as are put in Authority under him.* And (*b*) he recommends it as a laudable Statute of our Religion, that we are required *to be ſubject to all Higher Powers, as Servants are to be to their Maſters, Wives to their Huſbands, the Church to its Lord, and Diſciples to their Paſtors and Teachers.*

S. *Ambroſe,* who lived at the ſame time with him, diſcourſing of thoſe Words of *David, Againſt* Thee only *have I ſinned, and done this Evil in thy ſight,* gives this Reaſon of the Reſtriction, (*c*) *Rex utiq; erat, nullis ipſe legibus tenebatur* ; Being *a King, he was puniſhable by no Human Laws* ; *inaſmuch as Kings are free from the Bonds of their Offences. For no Laws can require them to be puniſhed, becauſe the Power of their Command protects them againſt it.* And if in his judgment not puniſhable by Law, then certainly not puniſhable by their own Subjects without, and againſt Law. And treating of the Doctrine of S. *Paul,* (*d*) he affirms, *Theſe Words,* He that reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, *to be levelled againſt ſuch as truſt to their own Strength, thinking themſelves out of danger of being brought to account for their Diſobedience, and hope by this means to eſcape the Law. The Apoſtle,* ſays he, *informs ſuch, that God's Law is not to be evaded; but howſoever they may eſcape for a while, the Judgment of God will moſt certainly overtake them at the laſt.* And when the Emperor *Valentinian* the younger had been prevailed upon, at the inſtance of his Mother *Juſtina,* to yield that two of the Churches at *Milain* ſhould be delivered to the *Arians,* and this holy Man was required to deliver them accordingly ; he pleaded for himſelf the Unlawfulneſs of doing it, and that therefore he could by no means comply. But however he profeſſed, he would readily ſubmit (*e*) wherever he

(*a*) Orat. 27. *p.* 471.
(*b*) Orat. 17. *p.* 270.
(*c*) *In* Pſal. 50.
(*d*) *In* Rom. 13. 2.
(*e*) *L.* 2. Epiſt. 14.

could; and if the Emperor ſhould think fit to demand whatever he had of his own, he would not refuſe to ſurrender it; and if he were to be impriſoned, or put to death, he would not oppoſe it; and commended his People for their Patience and Quietneſs under ſuch a Trial. *For what*, ſays he, *could be ſpoken better by Chriſtians, than what the Holy Ghoſt has ſpoken in you to day?* Rogamus, Auguſte, non pugnamus. Non timemus, ſed rogamus. *We beſeech thee, O Emperor, we do not fight againſt thee. We do not fear how thou mayſt uſe us, but we beſeech thee to hearken to us. Thus it becomes Chriſtians to deſire the continuance of Peace and Faith, and to perſevere in the Truth, though when in danger of dying for it.* And when he underſtood the Soldiers had actually taken poſſeſſion of the Church, he fetcht a deep Sigh, and ſaid to thoſe who would have perſuaded him to go thither, *Tradere Baſilicam non poſſum; ſed repugnare non debeo:* I cannot deliver up the Church; but yet I muſt not ſeek to preſerve it by Reſiſtance. I do not know how far Mr. *H.* can contrive to interpret theſe Paſſages of S. *Ambroſe* in favour of Reſiſtance; but all the World beſides, muſt own them to be diametrically oppoſite to all Attempts of that nature.

And ſo is what follows out of his Contemporary *Gregory Nyſſen*; who ſpeaking of the Emperor, expreſſes himſelf in this manner. (*a*) *We call him his own Lord, and ſay, he has no Lord over him, but is Ruler over all the People. Nor is it any Lye to ſay concerning him, that the name of King denotes a freedom from a ſuperior Lord. Nor do we own any neceſſity, that if this Word be underſtood to mean one's being his own Lord, and under no other's Dominion, it ſhould therefore no longer imply an Authority over the Subjects. For the name of Empire, or Kingdom, being of a middle Signification between theſe two, imports partly a Freedom from any other Lord, and partly a Dominion over others.* Where he manifeſtly declares the Prince to be ἀδίκαστον, *without any Superior upon Earth*, and conſequently unaccountable to all but God Almighty, and in

(*a*) C. Eunom. *l.* 1. *p.* 400.

in particular to be so in respect to his own Subjects.

I have a little before observed what account S. *Ambrose* gives of *David*'s Confession to God, *Tibi soli peccavi*; *Against* Thee only *have I sinned*; And here I must add that S. *Jerome* gives the same Reason of that Expression, *Rex erat, & alium non timebat*; *Being a King, he had none to fear but God*; as much as to say, that God only had the Power of calling Kings to account, and therefore not their own People.

Optatus Milevitanus reprehends *Donatus*, for his undutiful carriage towards the Emperor, in contradiction to S. *Paul*'s Doctrine, and charges him with (*a*) *Studying to do wrong to sovereign Powers, for whom, would he have hearkened to the Apostle, he would have taught him to pray daily. For so he required in his first Epistle to* Timothy: *Pray for Kings and Powers, that under them we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life. And this, says the Apostle, ought to be done*, etiam si talis esset Imperator qui gentiliter vivit, *though the Emperor were a Heathen*; *how much more then, when he is a Christian, a fearer of God, religious, and merciful?* I doubt not but Mr. *H.* will own Obedience and even Non-resistance is due to such a Sovereign thus qualified for the promotion of God's Service, and his People's Good. But if he pleases to look back to the Words immediately before, he will see this Submission and these Prayers are owing not only to a Christian, pious, religious, and merciful Prince, but to one that should live as do the Heathens. And not only so, but if he should be a malicious and persecuting Heathen, an Enemy to and Hater of the true Religion, or how ill soever qualified, he presently subjoins a Reason, that shews it unlawful to resist even such a Governor. (*b*) *Cum super Imperatorem non sit nisi solus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem*; namely, That *the Emperor has none above him but God alone, who made him Emperor*; or in other Words, He is answerable for his Misgovernment to no one, but God himself, who is his only Superior, and

(*a*) C. Parmen. *l.* 3. *p.* 66. (*b*) *P.* 67.

from whom he received his Commiſſion and Authority; *That there is no Power but of God*, ſays S. *Auguſtin*,(*a*) *is teſtified by the Mouth of Wiſdom*, By me Kings reign, and by me Tyrants poſſeſs the Earth. *So alſo ſays the Apoſtle*, There is no Power but of God. *And that it is highly reaſonable it ſhould be ſo, is taught in the Book of* Job; Who ſetteth a Hypocrite to reign, becauſe of the Wickedneſs of the People. *And concerning the People of* Iſrael *ſaith God*, I gave them a King in my Wrath. *For there is no injuſtice in wicked Mens receiving a Power to do Miſchief, to the end, that the Patience of good Men may manifeſt it ſelf, and the Iniquity of the Wicked may be puniſhed. For by the Power given to the Devil* Job *was tried, that he might appear Righteous*; Peter *was tempted, that he might not preſume upon his own Strength*, Paul *was buffeted, leſt he ſhould be exalted above meaſure*; *and* Judas *was condemned, that he might hang himſelf.* And upon another occaſion ſays he, (*b*) *A Man ſhould not diſdain to ſerve even a bad Maſter, heartily, and willingly, and lovingly*; adding withal, that *what he ſpake concerning the Maſter and Servant, was to be underſtood in like manner concerning the Powers and Kings, and all that are in the high places of this World.* And at another time he asks, (*c*) *Quid ergo? Eos Chriſtiani offenderunt?* How is it then? *Have the Chriſtians done any thing to offend them? Have they not performed their Duty to them? Wherein is it that the Chriſtians have failed of their Obedience to the Kings of the Earth? Hence it evidently appears, that their Perſecutions are without Cauſe. But mark what follows:* And my Heart was afraid becauſe of thy Word. *They likewiſe had threatning Words, I drive you out, I baniſh you, I rake you with iron Claws, I roſt you with Fires, I deliver you up to the Fury of the Beaſts, I tear you limb from limb. But thy Words have terrified me abundantly beyond all this.* "Fear not "thoſe who kill the Body, and after that have nothing "more that they can do; but fear him who has power "to caſt both Soul and Body into Hell." Sure S. *Auguſtin*

(*a*) De nat. boni, c. Manich. *c.* 32.
(*b*) Enarr. *in* Pſal. 124. (*c*) *In* Pſal. 118.

ſtin did not think (*d*) *a Paſſive Nonreſiſtance would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Oppoſition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* All his care was to fortify the Soul for patient Suffering, that it might not be endanger'd by the Inſults and Threats of ſuch, whoſe utmoſt Rage could reach no farther than this Life. But as for the temporal Welfare of themſelves and their Poſterity, though a very valuable Bleſſing, this he thought of ſo little concern in compariſon of their eternal Salvation, that he takes no manner of notice of it. So far was he from directing to this as their end, or inviting to reſiſt their tyrannical and diſorderly Governors in order to it. The natural Inference from theſe Words, is, that a good Chriſtian, ſuch as S. *Auguſtin* was, and ſuch as he ſpeaks of in this place, will chuſe quietly and patiently to ſubmit to the utmoſt Severities of his perſecuting Sovereign, rather than provoke Almighty God againſt his own Soul, which were the only two ways he thought them like to deliberate about; for he never in the leaſt ſuſpects them to have had any thought of flying to Arms againſt their perſecuting Princes.

The next I ſhall mention is S. *Chryſoſtom*, who lived as S. *Auguſtin* did in the latter part of the fourth, and beginning of the fifth Century. Who ſpeaking of the Civil Governor, affirms, (*e*) that *whoſoever is not obedient to him, fights againſt God, who has enjoined Submiſſion to him.* And a little after, he in other words preſſes the ſame Duty, and from the ſame Conſideration of God's Injunction in the caſe, together with the Vengeance he has threatned to the refractory and diſobedient. *Be not aſhamed therefore, ſaith the Apoſtle, of ſuch Subjection, for the Law of God requires it; and he will be a ſevere Revenger of the Indignities offered to his Miniſters; as whoſoever diſobeys them, will find to his coſt. For he ſhall not be puniſhed with any common Puniſhment, but with ſuch as is exceedingly ſharp. Nor ſhall any thing ſecure him from being called to a ſevere account by Man, beſides that he provokes Almighty God, in a peculiar manner, againſt his own Soul.* And upon

(*d*) *Meaſures of Submiſſion*, p. 8. (*e*) *In* Rom. 13. 2.

on another occasion, instead of exclaiming against the Emperor's Cruelty and Rage, and inviting his Subjects to arm in their own Defence, he takes a quite contrary course, such as Mr. *H.* would never have advised to, lest so the Community and their Posterity after them, should be utterly undone by it. (*e*) *Let us prostrate our selves*, says he, *at the Emperor's Feet, or rather let us beseech our good and gracious God, to asswage the Emperor's Fury, and render him propitious to us.* And commending *David*'s Carriage towards *Saul*, his causeless, yet implacable Enemy, he represents him, thus expressing his sense of Duty to him, (*f*) *that though he could not admire his manner of Life, nor boast of his good Deeds, he considered in what an honourable Station God had set him, that he was his Anointed, and therefore reasoned thus in his favour; Why say you he is a most abominable King, guilty of great Irregularities, and my own Enemy to the last degree? Remember he is however my King, he is my Prince, and God has given him Authority over me. He did not say, he was his King only, but he was the Lord's Anointed; laying a greater weight upon the Honour he had received from above, than on that which was done him by his Subjects here below.* After which he cautions to observe this following Admonition; *Thou despisest thy Fellow-Servant, yet see thou reverence him as he is thy Lord; and if thou hast no regard for him who is ordained to this high Office, at least have some for him who has ordained him. For if we fear, and stand in awe of those Rulers who are appointed by the King, though Evil, Robbers, Unjust, or howsoever otherwise ill inclin'd, not despising them for their bad quality, but respecting them for the worth of the Sovereign who has appointed them, how much rather ought this to be done where Almighty God has himself appointed them?* And again he professes of *David*, (*g*) *God crowned his right hand, for being able to keep its Sword clean, and not died with Blood; he came out of the Cave, not with* Saul's *Crown upon his Head, but adorned with a Crown of Righteousness; not cloathed with a purple Royal Robe,*

(*e*) Orat. in Eutrop. *To.* 8. *p.* 70.
(*f*) Orat. 1. εἰς τ Δαβιδ κ) Σαὺλ.
(*g*) Orat. 2. εἰς τ Δαβ. κ) τ Σα.

Robe. but with a more than humane Meekneſs, brighter than all the fineſt Garments, and with greater Luſtre than the three Children out of the Furnace. And again, (*b*) *when he could have ſlain him that lay in wait for him, yet for God's ſake he would not, but choſe to live every day in Danger, rather than be delivered from ſo many Deaths, by ſlaying him who had deſerved ſo ill of him.* Thus clearly was S. *Chryſoſtom* for ſuffering from time to time, and enduring all outward Inconveniencies and Indignities, all Perils and Dangers from a wicked and malicious King, without making any allowance for reſiſting him, though in order to the Welfare of the Publick, which had a particular Relation to, and Dependance upon *David's* Eſcape and Safety.

Whereto may be added thoſe Sayings of *Syneſius*, in (*a*) an Epiſtle written againſt *Andronicus* Prefect of *Egypt*, and a ſevere Enemy to the Chriſtians; where he reckons bad and deſtructive Princes to be Scourges in God's hand, for the Chaſtiſement of a ſinful People. For thus he ſpeaks, "Οταν οὖν δεῖται κολαστῶν, &c. *When he has occaſion for ſome to puniſh thoſe that have offended him, ſometimes he makes uſe of ſuch Demons as have the Command over Swarms of Locuſts, ſometimes thoſe that cauſe the Peſtilence; and at one time a barbarous Nation, at another a wicked King; and in a word, ſuch Inſtruments as are fitted by nature to do Miſchief.* He likewiſe complains how ill the Chriſtians at *Pentapolis* were uſed by this *Andronicus*, ſo that through all the *Forum* was heard the doleful Sound of *Men groaning, Women lamenting, Children crying; and the whole City looked as if juſt taken by an Enemy, the chief and beſt part of it being ſet apart for the Exerciſe of his Cruelties, and the Royal* Portico, *formerly the Seat of Judgment, turn'd into a place of Execution.* Yet did not the Citizens ſound to Arms, they raiſed no Forces againſt ſo implacable, ſo mercileſs a Governor, but fell to their Prayers. And as for himſelf, he profeſſes *that he was little concerned for any Indignity that was offered*

(*b*) Orat. 3. εἰς τ Δαβ. κ τ Σ.
(*a*) Epiſt. 57. (*b*) Ibid. p. 196. & Epiſt. 69.

offered, or Violence that was done him; but rather gave thanks for it, remembring that it came from God's hand, and esteeming it as a sort of Martyrdom. Such a Sense had he of the Obligation he was under, to submit and attend to God's Correction, when coming by the Management of an Imperious and Wicked Ruler. He very well knew it became him to *bear the Rod, and him that had appointed it*; and to leave the consequence, as to the things of this World, to him who made and governs it, and will cause all to *work together for good to them that love him.* And accordingly when this same *Andronicus* (*i*) had behaved himself so insolently and impiously against our blessed Lord, and had haraſſed the Christians most intolerably, abusing the Priests of God so excessively, as neither *Phalaris* of *Agragas*, nor *Cephren* the *Egyptian*, nor the *Babylonian Senacherib* who sent to reproach the God of the *Jews*, would have dared to do, yet did they use no other than Spiritual Weapons against him. The Bishops met and pronounced him excommunicate, and to be look'd upon by all, and avoided, as such. And this was all the Opposition they made to him, though so outrageous an Adversary to their Lord, their Religion, and themselves.

I shall name but one more, and that is *Prosper Aquitanicus*, who lived also in this fifth Century; and expressly declares, that (*k*) *no Power is to be slighted by the Followers of the meek and holy* Jesus, *that Obedience is due from them to Kings, as well as Masters*, and that it is *honourable and glorious*, not to rise up against such of them as are Enemies to the publick Happiness, but *as to love those that are Good, so also patiently to bear with the Bad.* He knew as the poor persecuted Christians had found by long Experience, that Wicked and unjust Governors were frequently to be expected, as the State of this World is, wherein the Bad of

(*i*) Epist. 58.

(*k*) Mitibus & sanctis nulla est spernenda potestas:
Æquum servire est Regibus & Dominis.
Ut Christi famulis ad verum prosit honorem,
Dilexisse bonos, & tolerâsse malos.
Epigr. 34. *De obsequiis debitis.*

of all sorts are so much more numerous than the Good. But he, as well as those others before mentioned, was wholly unacquainted with Mr. *H*'s new Doctrine, that (*l*) *supposing it true* that Governors *act contrary to the end of their Institution, invade the Rights of their* Subjects, *and attempt the ruine of the* Society *over which they are placed; it is lawful and glorious for these Subjects to consult the Happiness of the Publick, and of their Posterity after them, by opposing and resisting such Governors.* He had not learn'd this new Doctrine, I say, a Doctrine not then known to Christians, and which had it been broached by any Innovator, would, we may be sure, have been rejected with the utmost Indignation.

I have now gone through the four first Ages of the Church, and half the fifth; and need proceed no farther, these Instances hitherto alledged, being enough to shew beyond all Contradiction, what the Christians of these several Ages believed, and taught, as to the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and under what Obligations they thought themselves upon all Occasions to the Practice of it. They exhorted to fear the King as God's Ordinance, and not to resist him upon any account. They gloried in being the best of Subjects, and professed themselves to pray for the Safety and Welfare of the Emperors, and their Posterity, and of the whole Empire; duly paying their Tributes, acknowledging them not only to be constituted by God, but to be less than him only, next to him, above all Men living, and so accountable to none of them; loving, honouring, reverencing them, and allowing of no other Weapons against them but Prayers and Tears; beseeching, not arming against, nor ever daring to revenge themselves upon their sharpest Persecutors; but chusing freely to die, that they might the sooner be delivered from the Malice of their Adversaries, and enstated in the Glories of the other World; advising their Brethren *to be quiet, and do their own Business*, and upon no account to raise any Tumults or Commotions, but to prefer their In-

(*l*) *Measures of Submission*, p. 40.

Integrity before their Lives, or any thing they could enjoy or hope for here, and to endeavour the Defence of their Religion, not by Fighting, Injuſtice, or any kind of Wickedneſs, but by Patience, by Meekneſs, by Submiſſion, by Reſignation of themſelves to the Divine Will, and if neceſſary, by laying down their Lives in obedience to it; looking upon the Oppoſers of thoſe in Authority, as Fighters againſt God, who has commanded Submiſſion and Obedience as the Subjects Duty, and will ſeverely puniſh ſuch as take a contrary courſe, though with ever ſo good a Deſign and Intent, and though ſuppoſed to tend ever ſo much to the Advantage of the Society. They were perfect Strangers to Mr. *H*'s Doctrine of *Reſiſtance in ſome Caſes*, and inculcated the contrary Duty of Subjection, but never perſwaded to take up Arms againſt their Sovereign. This was their Doctrine. And that their Practice was anſwerable to it, and they did not impoſe upon others, what they were not willing to perform themſelves, is what I come now to ſhew, But that will be the buſineſs of the next Section.

SECT. II.

What the Practice of the Primitive Chriſtians was in the Point of Obedience to Governors.

HEre I am to ſhew, as I have juſt now intimated, that theſe ſincere, devout, and truly religious Followers of our Lord, did not *lay heavy Burdens upon others, which themſelves would not move with one of their Fingers.* They did not call upon others to ſubmit to their cruel, perſecuting Governors, and refuſe to do it themſelves when called to it; but were forward enough upon every occaſion to ſet themſelves a Pattern of what they taught, to the great Surprize and Aſtoniſhment of the Beholders, and even of their moſt bitter Enemies. Neither Reproaches, nor Affronts, nor Confinements, nor Racks and Tortures, nor Confiſcation of Goods, nor Death in all its moſt diſmal Shapes, could in any wiſe tempt them to reſiſt their lawful Superiours. Such a *Fear* had they of *God and*

and the King, that they durſt ſhew themſelves undutiful, and *diſobedient to neither of them*; but ſtudied rather to mitigate the Fury of their Perſecutors, by a ſubmiſſive and reſpectful, and quiet Behaviour towards them, under all the ill Uſage they met with. They kept in mind the Doctrine of their Religion, and the Example of their bleſſed Lord, who *was made perfect by Sufferings*; and could not but reflect and be ſenſible how ill Reſiſtance in any caſe became the Diſciples of ſo meek and paſſive a Maſter. And they were ſo far from venturing upon it, whatſoever Provocation they had to it, that they were all along moſt ſignally remarkable for their unſhaken Fidelity and Loyalty to all their Princes. More particularly,

I. They were careful to pray for their Governors, tho' Enemies to, and Perſecutors of themſelves and their Religion, which was dearer to them than all the things in this World. They knew they were commanded, to (*a*) *pray for Kings and all in Authority*, and accordingly they ſhewed themſelves ready to perform this truly Chriſtian Office, for the Emperors, and other inferiour Governors, as God had given them in charge. This I have already ſhewn in part, from what I have cited out of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Theophilus Antiochenus*, *Dionyſius*, and *Optatus*. *We pray for you*, ſays *Juſtin Martyr* to *Antoninus Pius* and his Sons, *that together with your Royal Power, you may enjoy a ſound Mind. We pray for you*, ſays *Athenagoras* to *Marcus Antoninus* and his Son *Commodus*, *that the Son may ſucceed his Father, as is moſt juſt, and that your Government may be extended far and near. I will honour the King*, ſays *Theophilus*, *not worſhipping him, but praying for him. We*, ſays *Dionyſius*, *pray to the one God for the Emperors* Valerian *and* Gallienus, *and for the Stability and Safety of their Empire.* And *Optatus* cites S. *Paul* teaching *to pray for Kings and Powers, that with them we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life.*

And before all theſe, *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smyrna*, and a glorious Martyr for the Faith, writing to the *Philippians*, gives

(*a*) 1. *Tim.* 2. 2.

gives them this Charge, (*a*) *Pray for all the Saints, pray also for Kings, and Powers, and Princes, and for them that persecute you, and hate you, and are Enemies to the Cross of Christ; that your fruit may be made manifest amongst all, and that you may be perfect in him.*

And the Story of the (*b*) *Thundring Legion* is well attested, (*c*) who prayed for the Emperor *M. Antoninus* in his great straight, when his whole Army were like to perish with Thirst for five days, and immediately obtained from God a cool refreshing Shower upon themselves and their Army, and a Storm of Hail and Fire upon their Enemies.

We pray for all Emperors, says *Tertullian*, (*d*) *that God would be pleased to grant them a long Life, and a quiet Reign, that their Family may be safe, and their Forces Valiant, that their Senate may be faithful, and their People orderly and virtuous, that they may rule in Peace, and have all the Blessings they can desire, either as Men or Emperors.* So likewise says he, (*e*) *We pray for the Emperors, and for their Ministers, and all in Authority under them, for the Happiness of the State, for the Peace of the Empire, and for its lasting Continuance.* And again, (*f*) *We sacrifice for the Safety of the Emperor, but to our God, and his, and as we are commanded, with unfeigned Prayer.* And presently after, (*g*) *We pray the more earnestly for the Emperor's Safety, beseeching him who can grant us our Petitions.*

Eusebius likewise tells us, of the Emperor *Gallus*, the Successor of *Decius*, That (*h*) *he was very cruel to those holy and religious Men*, meaning the Christians, *who earnestly besought Almighty God for the Peace of his Empire, and the Safety of his Life, thereby rendring all their Prayers for him ineffectual.* Which is another illustrious Instance, of the Christians continuing to supplicate Almighty God, in behalf not of their good Governors only,

(*a*) *Edit.* Oxon. *p.* 60.
(*b*) Κεραυνοβόλος. *Xiph. in vit.* Mar. Antonini.
(*c*) Just. Mart. *Apol.* 2. *in fine.* Tertull. *Apol. c.* 5. *& ad* Scap. *c.* 4.
(*d*) *Apol. c.* 30. (*e*) c. 39. (*f*) *Ad Scap. c.* 2. (*g*) *Ibid.*
(*h*) *Hist. Eccl. l.* 7. *c.* 1.

ly; but of those that were professed Enemies to their Religion, and to themselves because of it. And Mr. *H.* cannot say of such, that they were good Governors, and true Promoters of the Welfare and Happiness of the Society over whom they were set.

To the same purpose pleads *Arnobius*, (*b*) *How have the Scriptures deserved to be burnt? or the places of our Assemblies to be furiously pulled down? in which the most High God is prayed to, and Peace and Pardon is requested for all, and in particular for our Magistrates, Armies and Kings.*

So S. *Athanasius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his Apology to the *Arian* Emperor *Constantius*, (*c*) mentions it as a thing taken for granted, that he did not cease to pray for the Welfare of his Sovereign. And a few Lines after he pleads for himself, That he did *pray for his Safety*; and for the truth and certainty of this, calls upon the Lord to attest it, *who*, says he, *has heard me, and has granted you the whole Empire, as it descended from your Ancestors.* In like manner he appeals to *Philecesimus* President of *Egypt*, and *Ruffinus* the Treasurer, and *Stephen* the Controuler, and *Asterius* the Provost, and *Palladius* Master of the Palace, and *Antiochus* and *Evagrius* Superintendents, that he said only, Ἐυξάμεθα περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας Αὐγούστου Κωνσταντίου, *Let us pray for the Safety of the Emperor* Constantius, *and that all the People cried out with one Voice*, χριστὲ βοήθει Κωνσταντίῳ, O Christ help Constantius, *and so continued praying for a time*. Here we have a great Bishop and his People, offering up their Supplications and Intercessions for their Sovereign, not a true, sound, orthodox Christian, nor a Friend to those that were so, but a professed *Arian*, and a Zealous Promoter of that Heresy, and an irreconcilable Enemy to the better sort of Christians.

And *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* giving an account of the Worship of the Christians in his time, amongst other particulars mentions this, That after the spiritual Sacrifice finished, (*d*) *we beseech God for the common Peace of all*

F *the*

(*b*) Adv. Gentes. *l.* 4. *in fine.*

(*c*) Πῶς ἂν ὑπὲρ σῆς σωτηρίας ἀνόμην; Ad Imp. *Const.* Apol. *p.* 679. (*d*) Catech. Myst. 5. *n.* 6.

the Churches, for the good Estate of the World, for Kings and their Soldiers and Allies.

Nor do I know any instance of their refusing to proceed in this manner, but only in the case of *Julian* the Apostate, and this only at *Nazianzum*, and not till he had renounced Christianity, and initiated himself in Magick and Dæmonolatry, to that degree that they might perhaps conclude him to have committed the unpardonable Sin. As has been shewn at large by the learned Author of *Jovian, chap.* VI. *p.* 137, *&c.* Whither therefore I refer the Reader.

It were easy to heap up Instances to testify the Fidelity of the Christians in this respect, and their Zeal for their Sovereign's Welfare, though when far enough from being such as Mr. *H.* thinks the Ministers of God must necessarily be, unless they will divest themselves of all their Authority, and leave their Subjects at liberty to withdraw their Allegiance, and seek for others to supply their places; but I forbear. These few already mentioned are enough to shew, that this was one branch of that Duty, which was paid by the primitive Christians to their Princes. And though they speak here only of Praying for the Emperors and other Governors, and nothing directly against Resisting them, yet I cannot but think this a very good, a substantial, and unanswerable Argument against Resistance, and such as Mr. *H.* will not easily be able to reply to, if he please but duly to consider, what holy and devout Servants of God these were, and will be so kind, or so just to them, as not to charge them with the grossest Hypocrisy, in putting up these Prayers for the Happiness, the Prosperity and Safety of their Governors, and at the same time looking upon it as their Duty, not to bear with their Faults, and submit to their unjust Proceedings, but to rise up against them, and take the first opportunity of deposing them. As according to Mr. *H.* they ought to have done by most of them.

II. They willingly submitted to the hardest Usage they met with, from their merciless and persecuting Emperors. None that is in the least acquainted with the History

History of those Times, but must needs be sensible how they were harassed from time to time, and from place to place, what horrid Cruelties and Barbarities they underwent, and what vast Numbers of them chose rather to dye, whatever sorts of Death, than violate the Laws of their Religion, either by an undue Compliance with the sinful Commands of their Superiours, or by rising in their own Defence against them.

The very Heathens could advise (*e*) To look upon Governors as sent by God, and those that were bad amongst them as a Judgment from God, and (*f*) to receive their Lusts and Avarice with the same Patience and Submission to the Divine Will, *as Men do the Barrenness of the Earth, or excessive Rains, or other the like Calamities, considering that so long as Kings are but Men, they will have their Faults as well as others; but withal that the Case will not last the same always, but a change may come, that may prove a sufficient compensation for what they had endured.* And we may be sure, these faithful Disciples of our Lord were not less resigned, or less ready to bear all that at any time was laid upon them, with a quiet and contented Mind, referring themselves, and all their concerns, to the Divine Disposal. They acted like Persons, whose *Conversation* was really *in Heaven*, and could despise all things here below, as *not worthy to be compared with the Glories that shall hereafter be revealed; looking not at the things which are seen, and are temporal, but at those which are not seen, and are eternal.* We have large accounts of their Martyrdoms, but none at all of their Rebellions, though many times under the greatest Temptations, that the Fury of their enraged Adversaries could administer. *Who can tell,* says S. *Augustin,* (*g*) *what multitudes chose rather to dye the cruellest Deaths,*

(*e*) Ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες· ἐπεὶ, Διὸς ἐστὲν ἀνάκτων Θεῖότερον, &c. Callimach. Hymn. in Jovem.

(*f*) Quomodo sterilitatem, aut nimios imbres, & cætera naturæ mala; ita luxum vel avaritiam Dominantium tolerare. Vitia erunt donec homines. Sed neq; hæc continua; & meliorum interventu pensantur. *Cerealis* apud *Tacit. Hist. l.* 4.

(*g*) De civ. Dei. *l.* 22. *c.* 6.

than deny Christ to be God? The Safety of the City of God, as he adds a little after, *is such as may be preserved, or rather procured, together with, and by means of their Faithfulness; but this being once lost, they must expect no more Proselytes to come over to them. And this Thought well fixed in their steady and patient Minds, was the occasion of so many, and such glorious Martyrs.* And in his Comment upon the 118th *Psalm*, he puts these Questions, (*h*) *Nonne præcepit*, &c. *Has not he*, our Lord and Master, *commanded his Church to pray for Kings? How is it then? Can they charge the Christians with having any way offended them? What Dues have they not paid? Wherein have they not been obedient to the Kings of the Earth? Is it not therefore without any cause on their part, that they are so persecuted by them?* with more to the same purpose, as I have noted before.

Some, says *Tertullian*, (*i*) *underwent the tryal of the Sword, some of the Fire, some of the Beasts. Some in the mean time were Bastinadoed, and torn with* (*k*) *Iron-claws, and yet still kept in Prison, and not dispatcht out of the World.* At another time, (*l*) *They were stript of their Honours, and not only those of lower Station, but even the principal Men of the City, those who were of the first Rank, and every way best accomplished amongst them, were put to the Rack upon the slightest accounts, were Crucified,* (*m*) *or else were laid in Irons; besides that they had their Wives taken from them, and forced into the Seraglio.* (*n*) *They were Whipt in a more infamous and painful manner than Slaves had wont to be, were delivered up to the Beasts, to be swallowed down, rather than eaten by them. Whilst those who had no Dignity to lose, were condemned to the Flames, and sometimes were leasurely scorched with slow Fires, so that the Soles of their Feet were first parched till the Flesh was shrunk up*

(*h*) *To.* 8. *p.* 968. (*i*) Scorpiac. *c.* 1.

(*k*) Ungulæ erant instrumenta ferrea, quæ ungues avium referebant; unde & id nomen acceperunt; quibus laniabantur homines ut plurimum in equuleo extenti, &c. *Gisb. Cuper.* in *Lact.* de Mortibus Persecutorum. *c.* 16.

(*l*) *Lact.* de Mort. Pers. *c.* 21.

(*m*) *B.* Cyprian. *Ep.* 39. (*n*) Ibid.

up, and at length fell from the Bones. There were Torches lighted and put out again, and so applied to their several Parts, that nothing of them might be free. And during these Barbarities, to prolong their Misery, they had cold Water thrown in their Faces, and some given them to moisten their Mouths, that they might not be presently choaked; till their Skin being at length quite consumed, the force of the Fire made its way to their Vitals. And after this, when quite worn out, though they were burnt to Ashes upon a Pile prepared for that purpose, yet their Bones or any thing that remained of them, were not allowed to be interred, *but were beaten to powder, and cast into some River or Sea.* (o) *Great Numbers of them were every day publickly Roasted, Crucified, Beheaded, though guilty of no Crime, nor liable to any other Charge but only that they were Christians.* (p) *All kinds of Punishments and Torments were invented for them, Pans to fry them, Slings to shoot them, Caldrons to boil them, Chimneys to burn them, Lakes to drown them, Precipices whence to cast them down, Teeth of Beasts to devour them, Seas to drown them, distant Places whereto to banish them, not to mention other innumerable Instruments of Torture,* οὐδὲ λόγῳ ξυτὰ, οὐδὲ ἔργῳ φορητὰ, says S. *Chrysostom, such as were neither to be expressed by Words, nor in any measure tolerable,* that is to say, in *Lactantius*'s Language, (q) such *as no Patience, but which was divinely inspired, could overcome.* Which yet the same *Lactantius* tells us, (r) *They endured without any manner of complaint,* [much more without any thoughts of Resistance] *with a happy and invincible Submission, that deservedly astonished all the People, and all the Provinces, and their* hard-hearted *Executioners themselves, who could not but be surprized to see their greatest Cruelties conquered by a greater Patience.*

In like manner *Eusebius* relates of them, (ſ) *That they bare all sorts of Reproach and Punishment, making light of them all, in comparison of the Glory that was to follow,*

(o) Just. M. *c.* Tryph. & Clem. Alexandr. *Strom. l.* 2.
(p) *B.* Chrysost. *c.* Judæos. (q) *L.* 5. *c.* 13. (r) *L.* 6. *c.* 17.
(ſ) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 5. *c.* 1. & *l.* 8. *c.* 6. & de Laud. Constan. *c.* 7.

esteeming their Sufferings for their Religion, and even the several kinds of Death they were put to, as highly preferable to all the Splendor and Delights of this Life.

In short, they rejoiced in a conformity to the Pattern their blessed Saviour had set them; and like him *were brought as Sheep to the Slaughter*, and even to the most inhuman and terrible sorts of it, (*t*) μηδέποτε δὲ ἀμυνάσθαι τινὰ τῶν θυόντων, without ever imagining themselves at liberty to resist their Persecutors. *They were* (*u*) *put to the Sword, were hung upon Crosses, were sawn asunder, were whipt to death, were buried alive, were pulled in pieces by wild Beasts, were starved in Prison, were condemned to the Mines,* (*x*) *suffered Loss of all they had,* (*y*) *were Flead,* (*z*) *were Roasted,* (*a*) *were Broiled, were Empaled, were Beheaded,* (*b*) *and at last were left unburied.* Thus (*c*) multitudes of them were served every day, and as I said before, (*d*) not for any Crime they had been guilty of, but purely for their Religion sake, and because they professed themselves Christians. Yet all this while they breathed forth nothing but Patience, and Contentment, and Resignation to the Divine Will, and a Hope and Desire of a better State, and of all that Bliss and Glory, which is promised in the other World, to such as love and fear God.

And dares Mr. *H.* blame them for such their submissive and truly Christian Deportment, under all their severest Trials, for which their Memory has been ever since deservedly admired and honoured upon Earth, and themselves glorified in Heaven? Dares he charge it as a Sin upon these Holy, and Devout, truly Pious, and Heavenly Souls, that they had too little regard for this World, and too much for the other; and that it was an

(*t*) Orig. *c.* Cels. *l.* 3. *p.* 115.
(*u*) Just. M. *c.* Tryph. *B.* Chrysost. *c.* Jud. *l.* 2. Euseb. *H. E. l.* 8. *c.* 7, 8, *&c. B.* Gregor. *Expositi. moral. l.* 32. *c.* 12.
(*x*) *B.* Cyprian. de lapsis. (*y*) *B.* Cypr. epist. 58.
(*z*) Clem. Alex. strom. *l.* 2.
(*a*) *Socrat.* Hist. Eccl. *l.* 3. *c.* 15. Prudent. Peristeph. *hymn.* 3, *and* 10. (*b*) Alteserr. in Anastas. *p.* 18.
(*c*) Clem. Alex. str. *l.* 2. *p.* 414. (*d*) Id. *l.* 4. *p.* 505.

an unpardonable Error in them, to seek, by *losing their Lives* here *for their Saviour's sake, to save them* to all Eternity hereafter? Dares he upon second Thoughts undertake, to censure them, as not standing up for the Rights and Liberties of Mankind, but betraying the Privileges, giving up the Safety, and ruining the Happiness of the Society they belonged to, both for the present and for succeeding Generations? It is most certain that (*a*) no Commotions, or Seditions, no Rebellion, or Resistance of Authority was either begun, or promoted by them, how *contrary* soever their *Governors acted to the End of their Institution*, and how unmercifully soever they *invaded the Rights of their Subjects, and attempted the Ruin of the Society over which they were placed. These Subjects* did not think it *lawful to consult the Happiness of the* Publick, *and of their Posterity, by opposing and resisting such Governors*; but that this was the wrong way to promote the *Publick Happiness*, and it was their *Duty, and Glorious for them*, to suffer patiently all their Oppressions, and depend upon God's good Providence *for the Happiness of Human Society*, in whose Power alone it was to preserve it. And if Mr. *H.* will condemn them for this, he must at the same time condemn our Blessed Lord himself, whose Pattern they set themselves to follow, his Gospel which required it of them, and his Apostles who instilled these Notions into them. But this is not all.

III. As their Sufferings were Excessive in themselves, so to add to the weight of them, they were in many cases without so much as a Pretence of Law. This I confess is not so directly against Mr. *H.* who affirms, as I have formerly observed, (*b*) *That should all who are possessed of Power, in any Form of Government, consent and agree to enslave the People committed by Providence to their Care, and make them miserable, there is nothing in Nature, or in the Christian Religion, that can hinder the People from redressing their Grievances, and from answering the Will of*

(*a*) Οὐδὲν γὰρ σάσεως ἔγγον ἐπιδείξαι χριστιανῶν ὁ Κέλσος ἢ οἱ ὁμονοοῦντες αὐτῷ δυνάνται. Orig. *c.* Cels. *l.* 3. *p.* 115.

(*b*) *Part.* I. *p.* 144.

Almighty God, so far as to preserve, and secure the Happiness of the Publick Society. For according to him it signifies little, whether a Prince persecutes, or any way wrongs his Subjects by, or without Law. Yet because his Predecessor *Sa. Johnson*, and others of the same Stamp, have made a wide difference betwixt our Case, and that of the Primitive Christians, purely upon this account, namely, Because there was a Law of the Empire, which is still contained in the Fragments we have remaining of the XII Tables, (*a*) That forbids so much as privately to Worship any *New*, or *Foreign Gods*, *till publickly* received, or as (*b*) *Tertullian* represents it, *till approved of by the Senate*, and so the Persecutions of the Christians were supposed to have been according to the Laws of the Empire, and this to have been the only Reason of their Non-resistance; whereas if we be persecuted for our Religion, or have our Rights any way invaded by the Prince, each of these must be against Law, and we are therefore not obliged to submit to such illegal usage, any longer than till an opportunity offers itself for setting ourselves free; this, I say, being insisted on as a vast difference betwixt our own Case, and that of the Primitive Christians in the *Roman* Empire, that we have the Laws of our side, but the Laws were against them; I shall therefore apply myself to shew, that this is not a true State of the Case, and that these holy Disciples of our Lord, were not only persecuted

(*a*) Separatim nemo habessit Deos néve novos: sed ne advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto. *lib.* 1. Qui colendi. *Which* Pamelius *in his Notes upon* Tertullian's *Apologetick*, chap. 5. *gives us with some little difference of Expression.* Decretum autem istud extat, apud *Crinitum* de hon. disciplı. *l.* 10. *c.* 3. ex Pontificum libris, in hæc verba, separatim nemo sit habens Deos novos, sive advenas, nisi publicè adscitos, privatim colunto. *And* Rigaltius *upon the same Passage of* Tertullian, *tells us*, In Fragmentis *Ulpiani* legimus, Deos hæredes instituı non posse, præter eos quos Senatus consulto, constitutionibus Principum instituere concessum est. *As the ingenious Mr.* Reeves *has observed in his learned Notes upon that Apologetick.* (*b*) Apol. *c.* 5.

cuted according to Law, but they suffered in divers respects, not at all by the direction of the Laws, but quite against them, and in violation of the known Rights and Privileges of *Roman* Subjects.

It is noted of *Julian*, that amongst his other Arts to extirpate Christianity, and the ill Turns he did the Christians, one was to deprive them of the benefit of the Laws, the common Right of all Subjects. Wherein it is plain he did not persecute according to Law. He ordered (*a*) *to debarr them from all Assemblies, Markets, Publick Meetings, and the Courts of Judicature; none of which were to be allowed to any, but who would offer Incense as he had appointed.* Whereupon *Gregory* breaks forth into this Exclamation, Ὦ νόμοι, καὶ νομοθέται, καὶ Βασιλεῖς, &c. *O ye Laws! Legislators, and Kings! who being like the Beauty of Heaven, and the Light of the Sun, and the spreading of the Air, which are of common use, and for the Benefit of all, have accordingly enacted Laws for the good of all Freemen alike, of which yet this Emperor is however contriving to deprive the Christians, to the end that how grievously soever oppressed, they may have no Remedy left them, or if defrauded of any part of their Substance, or any other way injured, whether little or much, they may have no Tribunal to apply to,* but like outlawed Persons *be forced into Exile, be liable to be Slain, and may hardly be suffered to breathe.* This was their hard Fate under that malicious Apostate. Though by God's good Providence, the effect of it, as he informs us, was that they by their Sufferings recommended themselves to God, whilst on the other hand those who inflicted them, acquired to themselves only μείζω τὴν παρανομίαν καὶ ἀδοξίαν, *a heavier weight of Guilt, and a sorer Disgrace.* Nor can any thing be alledged in vindication of such unreasonable and unjust Proceedings.

Tertullian, well skilled in the *Roman* Laws, affirms of the Empire, that it was (*b*) *Civilis, non tyrannica Dominatio*; a Civil, not an arbitrary tyrannical Government. So that according to him, whose being in the right there

(*a*) Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 3. *adv.* Julian, *p.* 94. (*b*) Apol. *c.* 2.

there is no reaſon to doubt, the Subjects had their Rights and Privileges to inſiſt upon, and all was not left to the deſpotick Determination and Pleaſure of the Emperor. Nor could he make any Encroachment upon theſe, without doing wrong to his People, and diſobeying the Will of his only Superiour, the Lord Moſt High. So (*a*) *Tully* notes it *as the ſoundeſt Foundation of the* Roman *Liberty, that they had the diſpoſal of their own Rights.* Whence it neceſſarily follows, that whenſoever the Chriſtians had theſe Rights taken from them, without any forfeiture or guilt of their own, and ſolely by the deſpotick Will of the Emperor, or his inferiour Rulers and Magiſtrates, this was as much againſt Law, as it would be for any to ſuffer the like here, or in any other Chriſtian Nation. Yet that this was too common with them may eaſily be ſhewn in divers particulars of great importance, and which would touch them very nearly. *Tertullian* pleads that though it is a known and a ſtated Rule in Law, that where the caſe is the ſame, the Procedure againſt the accuſed ought to be ſo too, yet the Chriſtians were uſed differently from all other Criminals. (*c*) *When accuſed*, ſays he, *as guilty, we are treated in another manner, than any elſe in the like condition.* And *Euſebius* relates (*d*) That they were uſed like Enemies with all the rage and fury of War. And none can queſtion it, that ſhall but a little conſider what methods of Treatment they met with from their Governors, ſuch as were peculiar to themſelves, and uſed towards none of their Fellow-ſubjects. Of which I ſhall briefly inſtance in theſe following Particulars.

1. It was a Privilege of the *Roman* Citizens, not to be held in Bonds, or Chains. Upon which account it was S. *Paul* made complaint, amongſt his other Grievances, of his being (*e*) made a Priſoner. And when he had acquainted the chief Captain that he was a *Roman*,

(*a*) Orat. 35. pro Cornel. Balbo.

(*c*) Cur à vobis ipſis aliter tractamur, quàm pares noſtri, id eſt ceteri nocentes? cum ejuſdem noxietatis eadem tractatio deberet intervenire, *Apol. c.* 2.

(*d*) De vit. Conſt. *l.* 1. *c.* 23. (*e*) Acts 16. 37.

man, and *Freeborn*, we see what followed upon it; *(a) Then straightway they departed from him, who should have examined him; and the chief Captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.* Whence it appears how sacred this Right of the Citizens was held at *Rome*, and in the other Parts of the Empire, and how considerable the Danger of invading it was esteemed. The same is asserted by *Tully* likewise, who well understood their Laws, and was the most eminent Advocate they ever had. For he declares it *(b)* a heinous Crime to bind a *Roman* Citizen. Yet *Lactantius* assures us, that this did by no means excuse the Christians from this sort of Usage under *Maximian*, who upon his return home, after his Victory obtained over the *Persians*, *(c)* had the Chains ready for such as he could find no pretence to crucify.

2. Another inviolable Privilege was, that no Citizen should be *Scourged*. For which there is the same Evidence as before, part of S. *Paul*'s Complaint being *(d)* that *they were openly beaten*; and *Tully* branding such a Procedure, *(e) as a great Wickedness*. And *Grotius* upon *Acts* 22. 25. declares it to be against the *Porcian* and *Sempronian* Laws. Yet the forenamed *Lactantius* acquaints us, that this was no Protection to the Christians from *Maximian*'s Fury; *(f) but when any was to be beaten, he had four Posts prepared, by means whereof*, to add to the indignity of Whipping, *they were stretched to such a degree, as no Slave had ever been.* And *Eusebius* affirms *(g)* that Persons of all Ranks, Degrees, Relations and Ages, were *whipt*, as well as otherwise punished.

(a) Acts 22. 29.

(b) Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum. *c. Verrem. Orat.* 10.

(c) Si morte digni viderentur, cruces stabant; sin minus, compedes. *De Mort. Persec.* c. 21.

(d) Acts 16. 37. *(e)* Scelus verberari. *ubi supra.*

(f) Siquis esset verberandus, defixi in stabulo pali quatuor stabant, ad quos nullus unquam servus distendi solebat. *Lact. ubi supra.*

(g) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 11.

ed. And *Diocleſian* commanded ſuch as would not ſacrifice, *(a) to be puniſhed with ſtripes.*

3. Nor were they to be puniſhed *uncondemned. This*, ſays *Salvian*, *(b) is forbidden by the Laws of the* XII *Tables.* Yet thus S. *Paul* and *Silas* were uſed, *(c) being beaten openly and caſt into Priſon, uncondemned.* And it is but reaſonable to ſuppoſe that others after them would not eſcape better. In particular we learn from *Tertullian*, that in his time every thing ſerved for an Accuſation againſt the Chriſtians, and though impoſſible to be proved upon them, or unreaſonable to be ſuſpected of them, was yet enough *(d)* to incenſe the Multitude againſt them. *(e) If* Tiber *happened to overflow, or the* Nile *to keep within its Channels; if the Clouds withheld their Rain, or the Earth ſhook; or if Famine or Peſtilence aroſe, the cry was preſently without any more ado,* Chriſtianos ad Leonem, *Away with the Chriſtians, away with them to the Lyon.* As alſo a little before he had complained, *(f) That their Judges raged againſt them, ſometimes by the direction of the Laws, and ſometimes* animis propriis, *upon their own private Motions,* and to gratify their Animoſities, and the unreaſonable Averſion they had to them. And as if they were not bad enough, at other times the Rabble, *without conſulting the Judges, aſſaulted them with Stones and Fire.* Nor would they be prevailed with, ſo much as to ſpare their dead Corpſes, but *(g) after an inhuman manner haled them from the quiet of the Grave, from the ſanctuary of Death, when either ſo rotten or ſo mangled, as not to be diſtinguiſhed, cutting them in pieces, and dragging them about the Streets.*

4. They were in no caſe to be crucified, this being a ſervile Puniſhment, that none but Slaves could by the Laws of the Empire be made to undergo. So witneſſes the

---

(a) Lact. de mort. perſ. *c.* 10. *See alſo* Euſeb. H. E. *l.* 8. *c.* 8. *and c.* 10.

(b) Interfici enim quenquam hominem indemnatum, etiam duodecim Tabularum decreta vetuerunt. *De Gubernat. Dei. l.* 3. *(c)* Acts 16. 37.

(d) Illud ſolum expectatur, quod odio publico neceſſarium eſt. *Apol. c.* 2. *(e) C.* 40. *(f) C.* 37. *(g) Ibid.*

the forecited *Tully*, (*a*) declaring the Crucifixion of any one, who called himself a Citizen of *Rome*, to be a Crime of that prodigious magnitude, that all his Eloquence could not furnish him with a Name ignominious enough for it. Yet whatever exemption others had from this shameful, as well as painful Punishment, the Christians were to hope for none, but must expect to follow their Lord not only in dying for him, as he had done for them, but the same kind of death too. (*b*) *How slight soever the Cause of their Death was; nay and even in Civil Causes*, to which either no Death was due by the Law, or most certainly not this sort of Death, *they had Crosses erected for them*, which they would be sure to have used upon every occasion.

5. They were never to be condemned *unheard*. As is plain from *Acts* 25. 16. where *Festus* makes this publick Declaration before King *Agrippa*, *It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to dye, before that he which is accused, have his accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself, concerning the crime laid against him.* And *Grotius* upon *Acts* 16. 37. proves it contrary to the Natural and the *Roman* Law. To the former, from (*c*) *Hesiod* and (*d*) *Seneca*. To the latter, from (*e*) *Tully*, from (*f*) *Tacitus*, from

---

(*a*) Quid dicam in crucem tollere? verbo satis digno tam nefaria res appellari nullo modo potest. *c. Verr. ubi supra.* In crucem sic agere ausus es quenquam, qui se Romanum civem esse diceret? *ibid.*

(*b*) In causis levibus atq; civilibus, si morte digni viderentur, cruces stabant. *Lactant. de mort. pers.* c. 21.

(*c*) Μηδὲ δίκλω δικάσης περὶ δικαίου μῦθον ἀκούσας.

(*d*) Qui inauditâ parte alterâ aliquid statuerit, Æquum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuerit.

(*e*) De jure Romano testis *Cicero*, *Causâ cognitâ possunt multi absolvi, incognitâ nemo condemnari potest. The same also he teaches* Orat. 2. pro Sexto Roscio, *nocens nisi accusatus fuerit, condemnari non potest.*

(*f*) Inauditi atq; indefensi, tanquam innocentes perierant. *Histor. l.* 1. Quamvis invisum & nocentem, more tamen audiendum. *l.* 3.

from (*a*) *Tertullian*, from (*b*) *Apuleius*, and from (*c*) *Salvian*. And indeed *Tertullian* not only affirms this Truth, but makes it the foundation of part of his Apology in behalf of the Christians. Yet withal he bewails it as a great hardship, (*d*) That the poor innocent *Christians were not permitted to speak for themselves, whereby to manifest the Justice of their Cause, to defend the Truth, or prevent an unjust Sentence from passing upon them; nor was any thing more aimed at in their Tryal for fashion sake, but barely to inflame the Rabble, by a confession of their Name, without any enquiry into their Guilt. Quite contrary to their own usage in other matters. For if a Man was accused of Murder, Sacrilege, Incest, or Treason, they would not pass sentence upon his owning the name of an Offender in any of these kinds, without examining into the nature of the Fact, the place, the manner, the time, and who were privy to it, or actually engaged in it.* They could find nothing in the Christians upon the strictest Inquisition, whereon to ground a real Charge against them; and therefore having determined their Destruction beforehand, they thought it necessary to proceed against them only upon the Confession of their being such, against all Reason and Justice, and the Laws of the Empire, and their own Usage in all other cases. And not only so, but *Lactantius* relates, That (*e*) *their Priests and Deacons were seized, and without either their own Confession, or Proof against them, were condemned, and led to execution, together with their Wives and*

(*a*) Inauditum si damnant, invidiam iniquitatis merebuntur. *In Apolog.* Quando non licet indefensos & inauditos omnino damnari. *Adv. Nationes.*

(*b*) Nec ad instar barbaricæ feritatis, vel tyrannicæ impotentiæ, damnaretur aliquis inauditus. IX *Milesiarum.*

(*c*) Sed in urbe illâ non tam hominum fuerunt hæc beneficia, quàm legum: interfici enim indemnatum quemcunq; hominem, etiam XII Tabularum decreta vetuerunt. *Lib.* VIII. *in fine.*

(*d*) Sed Christianis solis nihil permittitur loqui, &c. *Apol. c.* 2.

(*e*) Comprehensi Presbyteri ac Ministri, & sine ulla probatione, aut confessione, damnati, cum omnibus suis deducebantur. *De Mort. Persec.* c. 15.

and Children. To the same purpose is that of *Justin Martyr*, (*a*) Οὐ κρίσεις ἐξετάζετε, &c. *Your Judgment is not founded upon a due Examination into the nature of the Charge, but being hurried on by your own unreasonable Passion, and by the instigation of the wicked Damons,* (*b*) *ye proceed to Sentence, before you are capable of judging, by reason of your not having enquired into the matter before you. Thus careless and unconcerned are you, what becomes of us.* And therefore being about to conclude his Apology, he begs for himself and his Fellow-Christians that the Emperors (*c*) would command a due Enquiry to be made concerning them; and pleads the Emperor *Adrian*'s Rescript in their behalf, wherein he orders (*d*) *Minucius Fundanus* (*e*) the Proconsul of *Asia*, *to give no handle to the Informers for encouraging their Malice against the Christians, and that he should not suffer them to be run down with Noise and Clamour, but if any of his Province had any thing to say against them, it should be done in open Court, and they should have free liberty to answer for themselves. And as on the one hand he would have the Christians duly punished, if they should be convict of having acted against the Laws; so on the other such as appeared to accuse them out of malice and ill-will, should be sure to suffer severely for it.* Which just and reasonable Appointment shews what had been the practice in relation to the Christians, and that they had been too commonly condemned in a tumultuous manner, and without a fair Hearing; because otherwise this Emperor had had no occasion to forbid it, and to enjoin a more regular Process against them. His care to rectify these Proceedings for the future, is too plain a proof that they had been exorbitant and unjustifiable, and so needed a regulation. And indeed to complain of this wicked Usage, seems to have been the great design of *Serenius Granianus* the former Proconsul's Letter to the Emperor. And that it was so *Eusebius* expressly

(*a*) Apol. 2. *p.* 55.
(*b*) Ἀκρίτως κολάζετε, μὴ ἐρευνῶντες. *ibid.*
(*c*) Κελεύσαι τὰς κρίσεις γενέσθαι. *p.* 99. (*d*) *P.* 99.
(*e*) *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. *l.* 4. *c.* 8.

expreſly teſtifies, the Content of this Letter being, as he relates, (*a*) ὡς ὐ δίκαιον ὂν ἐπὶ μηδενὶ ἐγκλήματι, βοαῖς δήμου χαριζομένους ἀκρίτως κτείνειν αὐτούς; *That it was no way conſiſtent with Juſtice upon whatever Accuſation, to be ſwayed ſo far by the Voice of the Multitude, as to put them to death without a legal Tryal.* This was a notorious abuſe of the Courts, and violation of the Subjects Rights, and the protection they ought to have had from the Laws, and yet if it had not been too commonly in practice, we may aſſure ourſelves the Proconſul would never have taken upon him to complain of it to the Emperor, nor would the Emperor have ſent his orders for the cure of it.

6. None were to be tortured, but in order to the Confeſſion of what could neither be proved upon them, nor otherwiſe obtained from them; the legal deſign of this method of procedure being only, to extort the Truth, when not diſcoverable by other gentler means. And *Tertullian* will not allow any good Governor to have uſed it towards his Subjects, as it was too frequently towards the Chriſtians, but ſuch only as preferr'd their own arbitrary Will before either Law or Juſtice. (*b*) *Tyrants*, ſays he, *make uſe of Tortures by way of Puniſhment; but juſt Rulers thought themſelves bound to uſe them only for fiſhing out the Truth.* And upon very good reaſon. *For Laws*, as *Franciſcus Zephyrus* ſpeaks in his Paraphraſe upon theſe Words, (*c*) *ſeem to have invented this way of Procedure, merely in oppoſition to the obſtinate denial of guilty Criminals. And therefore according to theſe, a free and open Confeſſion beforehand would inevitably prevent any Sufferings of this nature, there being no room left for Torture, after ſuch an acknowledgment.* Which *Tertullian* therefore juſtly looked upon as a cruel aggravation

(*a*) *Euſeb.* Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 4. *c.* 8.

(*b*) Apud tyrannos enim tormenta etiam pro pœnâ adhibentur: apud vos, ſoli quæſtioni temperantur. *Apol. c.* 2.

(*c*) Leges enim ideo tormenta excogitaſſe videntur, ut obſtinata flagitioſorum negatio expugnaretur. Nam ſi ultro fateatur, præveniatq; confeſſio quæſtionem, nihil eâ opus eſt, ſed vacat. *In loc.*

tion of their inhumanity and abuſe of the Chriſtians, that ſuch a Confeſſion from theſe did not put a ſtop to the Rack, as it would with all the World beſides, but on the contrary againſt all Pretence either of Law or Equity, brought it upon them. And accordingly he objects it as a ſhameful inſtance of Irregularity and Miſgovernment, as undoubtedly it was, (*a*) *That they were compelled by Torture to recede from their Confeſſion*, after they had made it, and were therefore to have been diſcharged, ſince they had done nothing whereby to deſerve, that they ſhould be proceeded againſt as Criminals; and that (*b*) *thoſe who preſided in this affair, and were appointed to ſearch out the Truth, applied their Power on the contrary with reſpect to the Chriſtians, and to none but them, to extort a Lye from them, and* (*c*) *to this end racked them, not only after their Confeſſion, but becauſe of it.* And at another time he urges it as what they could not pretend to deny, That (*d*) *their manner in relation to other Malefactors, when brought upon Tryal, and pleading not guilty, was to try if by the help of the Rack they could bring them to own their Guilt; but when Chriſtians confeſſed freely of themſelves, they muſt look to be racked upon a quite oppoſite account, namely to compel them to retract their Confeſſion. Thus perverſly were they treated, whilſt* their Tormentors, after an unaccountable manner, *ſet themſelves to ſtifle what they ſo publickly acknowledged, altering the deſign of their Tortures, diſmiſſing the truly guilty with impunity, and forcing others into the like guilt againſt their Wills; uſing a croſs ſort of Enquiry*, as *Minucius Felix*, (*e*) an Advocate in the Courts, well acquainted with the Laws, and of no ſmall Character in his Profeſſion, expreſſes it, (*f*) *not to draw forth the Truth, but to force out a Lye.* This was

G ſo

(*a*) Cogitis tormentis de confeſſione decedere, *ibid.*

(*b*) Veritatis extorquendæ præſides de nobis ſolis mendacium elaboratis audire. *ibid.* (*c*) Torquemur confitentes. *ib.*

(*d*) Ad Nationes. *l.* 1. *c.* 2.

(*e*) *Minutius Felix* non ignobilis inter Cauſidicos loci fuit. *Lact. inſtit. l.* 5. *c.* 1.

(*f*) Exercentes perverſam quæſtionem, non quæ verum erueret, ſed quæ mendacium cogeret. *Octav. p.* 257, 258.

ſo palpably, ſo ſcandalouſly partial in the Governors, and ſo heavy a burden upon the Chriſtians, that *Tertullian* repeats his charge of it over and over. He tells the Judges, (*a*) *This was ſuch a perverſneſs, as that they ought to ſuſpect themſelves under ſome ſtrong byaſs, that could incline them to act in ſuch direct contradiction to their uſual Forms in other caſes, to the nature and deſign of their Office, and to the very Words of the Law.* And again, (*b*) *You give very different Inſtructions to your Executioner with reſpect to us Chriſtians, not that they compel us to declare what we act, but to make us deny what we are.* So likewiſe ſays S. *Cyprian*, (*c*) *The uſe of Torture is for the Guilty, who diſclaim the Guilt they are charged with, that by this means the truth of the Crime which the Mouth will not own, may be preſſed out by the pain of the Body. But lo here quite otherwiſe, though I readily confeſs, and proclaim it, and again and again and as expreſly as may be, teſtify myſelf to be a Chriſtian, yet for what good reaſon I know not, you torture me upon my Confeſſion, which ought to have been done only upon my Denial.* And that this was no vain plea, but a true ſtate of the caſe, the Words of the Law are very clear, enacting Torture to be uſed ſolely for finding out the Truth. (*d*) *In criminibus eruendis quæſtio adhiberi ſolet. This ſort of Inquiſition is wont to be uſed for forcing out the Truth.* And again, (*e*) *Si aliter veritas inveniri non poſſit, licet habere quæſtionem. They may be thus examined when the Truth cannot be come at otherwiſe.* This therefore is the ſole End for which the Law appointed Torture. And nothing could be a fouler abuſe of the Law, and more diametrically oppoſite to the true deſign of Torture, than to apply it thus to a directly contrary purpoſe. Yet this was an uſual method of plaguing

(*a*) Suſpecta ſit vobis iſta perverſitas, &c. *Apol. c.* 2.

(*b*) Longe aliud munus carnifici in Chriſtianos imperatis, non ut dicant, quæ faciunt, ſed ut negent quod ſint. *c.* 7.

(*c*) Torquentur rei qui ſe negant crimine quo accuſantur teneri, ut facinoris veritas, quæ indice voce non promitur, dolore corporis exprimatur. Nunc vero cum ſponte confiteor, &c. *Ad Demetr.*

(*d*) *Digeſt. l.* 48. *Tit.* 18. *c.* 1. (*e*) *C.* 7.

plaguing the poor Christians, who could not have common Humanity shewn them, so long as they refused to renounce their most holy Profession.

And yet I have hitherto taken no notice of another Hardship put upon them in this respect; which was, That *(a) Children were called upon to accuse their Parents, and the most faithful Servants, and the Wives were put to the Torture, to make them witness against their Masters, and Husbands.* Which being against the Laws of Nature and Nations, as well as against the *Roman*, is a very remarkable Evidence of the Christians being persecuted against Law.

7. Those of Condition amongst the *Romans* were never to be tortured at all; as *(b) Gisbertus Cuperus* observes. And it is not therefore without reason, *(c)* that *Lactantius* represents it as a gross illegal Innovation, in *Maximin*, that he inflicted this sort of punishment upon the chief Magistrates, and the highest and principal Persons in any City. And in such an unwonted Invasion of their known Liberties, it is not to be imagined the Christians should escape a large share of it. In truth a particular care was taken that they should not; it being expressly ordered, *That those of that Religion should be subjected to it, (d) of whatsoever Rank or Quality they were.*

8. Whereas by the Law they were to be allowed Council to plead for them upon their Tryal, this Privilege was likewise denied them. *(e) They were not permitted the same liberty for clearing themselves, that others had freely granted them. When the Heathens were accused of the same Crimes, they had not only leave to speak for themselves, but might have Council also to set off their Case to the better advantage; nor were they to be condemned without a full Hearing. (f) But it was far otherwise* with

(a) Filii adversus parentes suspendebantur, fideliſſimi quiq; servi contra Dominos vexabantur, uxores adversus maritos. *Lact. de mort. pers. c.* 23.

(b) In Lact. de mort. pers. c. 13. (c) *C.* 21.

(d) Ex quocunq; ordine & gradu venirent. *Id. c.* 13.

(e) Tertull. *Apol. c.* 2. (f) De nobis nihil tale, &c. *ib.*

the Christians, *who might not offer what was necessary for their own Defence; though Justice would require their Charge to be thoroughly sifted no less than others. (a) The Eloquence of the Bar was sometimes silenced, the Advocates were destroyed, (b) and the Lawyers that should have assisted them were either sent into Banishment, or out of the World.* So that they had none to assist them in their Extremity, to urge the Law in their behalf, and either bring them off where there was room for it, or shew how unjustly they were handled, when sentenced against Law.

9. And to render the Case still more hard and dangerous, they had Judges who understood little or nothing of the Laws, but had been bred up and employed in as different a Profession as might be. *(c) Military Men, void of all Learning, were not only sent to try Causes in the Provinces, but without any Assessors to advise them,* as had been usual in other like cases; and as was more especially necessary in this, when the Judges were so scandalously unqualified for a due execution of the weighty Office they had taken upon them.

10. At other times it was ordered that the Christians should have no benefit of the Law, *(d) but their Judges might deal with them as inhumanly as they pleased.* And *(e) that none but Heathens might be admitted to any legal Remedy upon whatever occasion, Altars were placed in their Courts of Judicature, and all were required to offer upon them, before their Cause was allowed to be heard.* And as they might not plead without this heathenish compliance, so also

---

(a) Eloquentia extincta, causidici sublati, jureconsulti aut relegati, aut necati. *Lact. de mort. perf. c.* 22.

(b) Rectè hos distinguit, quia illi [*causidici*] causas in foro vel judiciis agebant; hi vero [*jureconsulti*] de jure respondebant. *Gisb. Cuper.* in loc.

(c) Judices militares humanitatis, literarum rudes, sine assessoribus in provincias missi. *Lactant. ibid.*

(d) Licentia rerum omnium, solutis legibus, adsumpta & judicibus data. *ibid.*

(e) Ne cui temerè jus diceretur, aræ in secretariis ac pro tribunali positæ, ut litigatores priùs sacrificarent, atq; ita causas suas dicerent. *id. c.* 15.

alſo on the other hand, *(a) any Action might be brought againſt them, whilſt* their Hands were thus illegally tied up, *and they could have none brought againſt ſuch as had wronged them in any ſort*, could neither ſue for reparation *upon Adulteries committed againſt them, or for their Goods taken away by Stealth or Robbery*; but muſt be contented to ſit down with the loſs, without hope of Redreſs, and perhaps be inſulted over for ſuch their Diſability. So that, as *Euſebius* writes, *(b)* they became a ſort of Outlaws, and in the condition of *beſieged Soldiers*, utterly unable to help themſelves.

11. They were ſtript of all their Honours and Dignities. So ſays *(c) Euſebius*, *If any* of our Religion were *in an honourable Station*, he was to become ἄτιμος, *ignoble*, without any Honour or Regard to be paid him for the future. This *Lactantius* alſo teſtifies, *(d)* as to thoſe who had Preferments or Honours to loſe. And as to thoſe of meaner condition, we have his Evidence likewiſe, that Slaves were not to be manumitted, without having firſt renounced their Chriſtianity, to qualify them for it. *(e) Libertatem deniq; ac vocem non haberent*; *They were to have no Freedom, or power of Voting.* Which Words are thus explained by *Euſebius*, *(f) As for Servants, if they retained their Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, they were not to be made Free.* So that, as *Baluzius* obſerves, *(g)* here were illegal Puniſhments appointed for all ſorts and orders amongſt them. Thoſe in higher ſtation were to be degraded, the generality or middle ſort were (as I noted juſt before) deprived of the benefit of the Laws, and the loweſt of them, the Servants and Slaves were to continue in that rank, without hope of that Freedom which by Law they would have a juſt claim

(a) Propoſitum eſt edictum, quo cavebatur, ut --- adverſus eos omnis actio caleret, ipſi non de injuriâ, &c. *Id. c.* 13.

(b) Οὐκέτι μὲν κοινῷ νόμῳ, πολέμιοι δὲ τρόπῳ τινὶ πολιορκημένων. Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 8. *c.* 10.

(c) Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 8. *c.* 2.

(d) Ut religionis illius homines carerent omni honore ac dignitate. *Lact. de mort. perſ.* c. 13. In primis honores ademit. c. 21. *(e)* Ibid. *(f)* Ubi ſupra. *(g) In* Lact. *c.* 13.

to; than which nothing could be more manifeſtly againſt Law.

12. Or if theſe Words of *Lactantius* may be underſtood in a larger ſenſe, as for ought I know they may, ſo as not to be reſtrained to Servants only, but to relate to the whole Body of Chriſtians, the abuſe will be ſo much the groſſer and more inexcuſable. *The Right of Suffrage* Sigonius affirms (*a*) to be *a matter of great moment, not only to the* Romans, *but any Citizens whatſoever.* And to have not only this, but other their known Liberties arbitrarily raviſhed from them, and ſo be unjuſtly deprived of an eſſential part of their Birthright, would be an Invaſion they would have ſufficient reaſon to complain of as illegal. And thus much is plain from a paſſage of this ſame *Lactantius*, declaring of *Maximian*, That he (*b*) made it his buſineſs to get Men deprived of their Liberty, *when he was afraid openly to avow it, becauſe againſt all pretence of Law.*

13. They were ſometimes allowed a Tryal, but proceeded againſt upon falſe and groundleſs Accuſations, contrived on purpoſe for their undeſerved Deſtruction. Not only *Nero* did this in ſetting *Rome* on fire, (*c*) and then caſting the blame of it upon the poor, harmleſs, innocent Chriſtians, and thereupon ordering them to be wrapt in Beaſts skins, and to have the Dogs ſet upon them in this dreſs, to tear them to pieces, or elſe to be crucified, or (*d*) to be burnt, being ſo daubed beforehand, as that they might ſerve for a new ſort of Flambeaux in the night-time: But the ſame Prank was plaid again by the moſt inhuman *Galerius* privately, (*e*) who *by the miniſtry of ſome hidden* Agents, had his Palace at *Nicomedia* ſet on fire, and then had the Chriſtians charged

(*a*) De antiq. jur. Civ. Rom. *l.* 1. *c.* 17.

(*b*) Quia id apertè jubere non poterat, ſic agebat ut & ipſe libertatem hominibus auferret. *De mort. perſ.* c. 21.

(*c*) Tacit. Annal. *l.* 15. & Sulpic. Sever. hiſt. ſacr. *l.* 2. *c.* 41. (*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Occultis miniſtris palatio ſubjecit incendium. Et cum pars quædam conflagrâſſet, Chriſtiani arguebantur velut hoſtes publici. *Lact. de. m. perſ.* c. 14.

charged with it, and plentifully put to death for it; as (*a*) *Eusebius* acquaints us. And as if all the forenamed Barbarities were not barbarous enough,

14. *Lastly*, They were put to unusual Deaths, and such as no Law directed. *Lactantius* asks, (*b*) *What number of Volumes can be expected to contain such infinite and different kinds of Cruelty*, as they were made to undergo? And again a little after, (*c*) he declares *it impossible to tell how many and how grievous sorts of Torments, their Judges had been able to invent for the carrying on their Design of extirpating Christianity.* And at another time, (*d*) *Non mihi si linguæ centum sint, oraq; centum, &c. Had I a hundred Mouths, as many Tongues, and a most lasting Voice, it would yet be above my power to recount all the wicked Inventions, and the several names of all the Punishments, which the Judges through the Provinces have found out for tormenting the righteous and innocent* Disciples of our Lord. All the mercilefs sanguinary Laws enacted against them, did not satisfy the Rage of their persecuting Princes; but they contrived other ways of their own to get rid of them. Thus *Sozomen* relates a private order of *Valens*, (*e*) for the destruction of about eighty Ecclesiastical Persons, for only coming to petition his Favour, and the mitigation of those Severities his Magistrates had executed upon them; that they should be secretly put on board a Ship, and made away with. By means whereof, under pretence of Banishment, they were carried off to Sea, and there (*f*) the Vessel was purposely set on fire, and *so they were all either burnt, or drowned.* As *Galerius Maximinus* in like manner, had before served a

(*a*) Οὐκ εἶδ' ὅπως ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὸν Νικομήδειαν βασιλεῖς, πυρκαϊὰς ἐν αὐλαῖς δὲ τὴν ἡμέρας ἀφειστας, ὧν καθ' ὑπνους φόβῳ πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέρων ἐπιχειρηθῆναι λόγῳ διαδοθέντι, παγγενῆ σωρὸν βασιλικῷ νάυαπ τῇδε θεοσεβῶν, οἱ μὲν, εἶπει κατεφθάρησαν· οἱ δὲ διὰ πυρὸς ἐτελειώθησαν. Hist. Eccl. *l.* 8. *c.* 6.

(*b*) Instit. *l.* 5. *c.* 11. (*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) De mort. pers. *c.* 16. (*e*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 6. *c.* 14.

(*f*) Οἱ μὲν ναῦται πυρὶ τὸ σκάφος καὶ ὑφάναντες, ὡς αὐτοῖς προσεταγμένον, ὑπεχώρουν εἰς τὸ ἐγγύτερον μεταπηδήσαντες. Ἡ δὲ ναῦς διελύθη σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀναδήλη κατακαεῖσα. ibid.

great company of poor People, at a time when by his exceſſive Exactions he had reduced the Empire to extraordinary Want and Diſtreſs; whom becauſe they were not in circumſtances to anſwer his unreaſonable Demands, *(a) he commanded to be ſhipped off and drowned.* Neither were the other tenderer Sex any more ſecure than the Men. For *Gregory Nazianzen* from amongſt others ſingles out a dreadful Story of *Julian*'s inhumanity towards them, *(b)* ϱϱίκης ϰ᾽ τοῖς ἀϰόοις ἄξιον, *a Story which might well ſtrike the moſt hardened Atheiſts at the mention of it*; nor could any thing poſſibly be ſaid in mitigation of ſuch unparallelled Barbarity; *When chaſte and holy Virgins, who had had their Converſation continually in Heaven, and rarely appeared amongſt Men, were publickly ſtript, and being firſt expoſed naked, had their Bodies at length mangled and diſſected, and their Fleſh eaten by thoſe more than brutiſh Tormentors.* Nor did their Fury ſtop here; but farther to glut their execrable Malice, *(c) They caſt Swines Food into their reeking Entrails, and then letting in the Swine upon them, regaled themſelves with the ſight of thoſe voracious Animals preying upon them, tearing and devouring them, after a manner never before ſeen or heard of,* in the execution of the moſt incorrigible and outrageous Malefactor. *Another (d) had his Fleſh torn from off the Bones, and then was waſhed with Salt and Vinegar, and broiled on a Gridiron. (e) Others had their Fleſh pared off, their Limbs disjointed, their Bodies torn with Whips, after all which, and infinite other Tortures, they were caſt into the Fire. (f) Some were drowned in the Sea, ſome were ſtarved to Death, ſome died upon the Gibbet, and ſome in a moſt woful manner had their Feet nailed to the Tree, and ſo hung till they died of Hunger. (g)* Others *were hanged up by the*

(*a*) Congregari omnes juſſit, & exportatos naviculis in mare mergi. *Lact. de m. perſ.* c. 23.

(*b*) Orat. 3. adv. Julian. *p.* 87.

(*c*) Σπείρειαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀπλάγχνοις συὸς τροφὴν ἐπασείραντες, ϰ᾽ σῶν ἐπιτείντες τὰς θερμοτέρας, οἷον ἀλγεῖν ἐκεῖνο τὸ θέαμα, σάρκας ἰδοῦσι ϰειμὰς συνεδιαφθείρας, &c. ibid.

(*d*) Euſeb. *l.* 8. *c.* 6. (*e*) *C.* 8. (*f*) Ibid. & Lact. *c.* 15. & *c.* 37. (*g*) Euſeb. *l.* 8. *c.* 10

the Hands tied behind them, their Limbs being artfully distended, and their whole Body grievously tormented, beyond what was wont to be done to Murderers. (a) Some were fastened up by one Hand only, and so hung in most excessive Pain. (b) Some were pricked under their Nails; some had melted Lead poured down their Backs, and others were tormented in a manner not fit to be named. In a word, *(c)* such was the *Fierceneſs and Inhumanity* of their Perſecutors, and ſo *ingenious their Cruelty*, that they employed themſelves *to invent new Puniſhments*, and ſeem never to have been better pleaſed, than when they could contrive to ſurpaſs all that had gone before in Severity and Torture.

Whoſe Heart is not ready to bleed at the relation of ſuch Tragical Uſage, of not only the innocent, but the pious and holy Servants of God, who in all reſpects had deſerved a far better Treatment? Yet multitudes of Inſtances might be produced, of Chriſtians thus dying illegal and unwonted Deaths, and which proceeded purely from the arbitrary Will and Pleaſure of their Perſecutors. But I forbear; and ſhall rather conclude with this Reflection in anſwer to Mr. *H.* If ever any Princes in the World forfeited their Authority, *by deflecting from the Will of God*, and the *End of their Inſtitution*, ſure the Authors of theſe intolerable, and the more ſo becauſe every way undeſerved, Cruelties, muſt have done it. Yet did not theſe abuſed Chriſtians look upon it, as conſiſtent with their Duty to fly to Arms, in order to their Deliverance from the power of ſuch blood-thirſty Tyrants, even when their Hands lay heavieſt upon them. Nor can Mr. *H.* produce ſo much as one inſtance of this nature, amongſt theſe meek and paſſive Followers of the Bleſſed JESUS.

No Times, as the excellent Mr. *Kettlewell* has rightly obſerved, *(d) ever afforded better Pleas for Reſiſtance than thoſe under theſe* forementioned *Perſecutions.* Yet were none

(a) Ibid. *(b) C.* 12.
(c) B. Cypr. *a* Demetrian. *p.* 190.
(d) Chriſtianity a Doctrine of the Croſs. ch. 4. p. 53.

none ever more *eminent for Passive-Obedience, or Faith and Patience, without taking Arms against their Governors, to defend themselves.* It is likewise Bishop *Bilson*'s observation, and Mr. *H.* cannot disprove it, *(a)* That *for the first 600 Years there cannot be shewn any one Example, where an Heretical Prince was deposed, or a Subject allowed to bear Arms against his Sovereign. A sufficient Conviction that Pagans and Hereticks were all this while honoured, obeyed, and endured by the Church of Christ, if they were Princes.* And Dr. *Hakewil* notes farther in justification of those first and purer Times of our Religion, as to the Duty of Subjects to their Princes, *(b)* That none then who bare the name of Christian, how heterodox soever in his other opinion, yet ever thought he might take upon him forcibly to resist his Superiours; and particularly as to the prevailing Sect at that time, that though S. *Jerome (c)* bewailed the sad change that was wrought in the World, and that *it was astonished to see itself all of a sudden so generally become* Arian; *yet did he never charge any* Arian, *as bad as they were in other respects, with Rebellion against the State*; this being what no sort of Christian had yet learned. Nor is this any more than what we find moreover in that learned Lawyer *Franciscus Balduinus*, who treating of *Minucius Felix*'s elegant Discourse, in defence of the Christian Religion, has this observation; *(d) Cum calumniator ingeniosus, &c. Whereas this acute Calumniator* [meaning *Cæcilius*] *did not stick at either forging, or enlarging, whatever might serve to expose the Christians, he had nevertheless taken no occasion to accuse them of Disloyalty and Rebellion. Though,* as he proceeds, *some before had objected it, and it seemed a very proper Engine for hastening their Destruction.* Of which undeserved Charge the learned Bishop *Parker* gives this account, which fully justifies them from it; namely, That *(e) though they were usually indicted of Treason by their Enemies,*

(a) *Of Christian Subjection*, &c. Part. 3. p. 401, 402.
(b) Scut. Reg. *l.* 3. *c.* 1. (c) Adv. Lucifer. *c.* 7.
(d) Prolegom. in M. Fel. Octav.
(e) *Religion and Loyalty.* Part. 1. p. 158.

Enemies, yet the only Proof of it was their refusing to Sacrifice, or swear *by the Emperor's* Genius. *And setting this aside, there was not any one Charge upon Record, of any one Act of Disloyalty; and that* (as says the forenamed learned Lawyer) *was the Glory of their Ancestors, that they would be provoked by no Injuries to any thought of Hostility, against lawful Sovereigns, howsoever barbarously they were treated by them, or enter into any Conspiracies against them, though at that time they were frequent and plausible; as being always mindful, what became their Patience, Meekness, Modesty, and Sobriety. So far were they from being Turbulent and Seditious, and running mad with a thirst of Revenge.* This Character too is given of them by Heathens as well as Christians, and therefore is so much the less liable to suspicion. I shall instance but in two of them, but those such as could not be themselves deceived, nor had any temptation to deceive others in favour of the Christians, especially the latter, who after his departure from them, became their subtle and implacable Enemy.

The one is the younger *Pliny*, the Proconsul of *Bithynia* under *Trajan*; and he gives this Character of those under his Jurisdiction, (*a*) That he could find no other fault in them, *but a Stubbornness and inflexible Obstinacy*, that is to say, in resolving not to sacrifice to the *Roman* Deities; adding farther for their Honour, that though he had tortured two of the weaker Sex who had come off from them, he could learn nothing more from these, than *that they were wont on a certain day*, which I take to mean every Lord's day, *to assemble before it was light, to repeat a Hymn to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by a solemn Oath, not to commit any sort of Wickedness, any Thefts, Robberies, or Adulteries; not to break their Word, or deny what was depositted with them.* Where it is remarkable that upon his strictest Inquisition, he could find no pretence to charge them, with any Principles of Sedition or Treason, or any Resistance of the Emperor, or of Himself his Vicegerent. The

(*a*) *Lib.* 10. *Epist.* 97. & Tertull. *Apol.* c. 2. & *Niceph.* l. 3. c. 7.

The other I designed to appeal to is the wicked Apostate *Julian*, who considering his former manner of Life, could not possibly be ignorant of either the Doctrines or Practices of the Christians; yet he bears them this Testimony, not out of good-will we may depend upon it, but only because it was too plain to be denied, That they encouraged no Insurrections or Rebellions, no *Resistance in some cases*, but on the other hand were sure presently to punish any that they found offending in this respect. (*a*) Εἴ τινας εἰς τὸ βασιλέα ἐπίδοιεν ἀπειθοῦντας, αὐτίκα μάλα κολάζουσι. *They no sooner discover a Subject behaving himself undutifully towards his Prince, but they immediately take him to task for it.* A noble Evidence in their favour, considering from whom it comes! And which upon that account may perhaps be thought preferable to many of those we have from such as were of their own side.

Thus I have shewn in divers particulars, what illegal Usage the ancient Christians met with from time to time, from their cruel Persecutors. And I have insisted the longer upon it, as to convince Mr. *H.* that these eminent Professors of our Faith, durst not resist such Governors as were certainly Enemies to the Good of the Society, so likewise to let some others see that they were thus patient and submissive, when not only Persecuted for the sake of their Religion, but moreover when Persecuted against Law.

And now if Mr. *H.* or any else, should object that some few of the divers Illegalities here enumerated, concerned not the Christians barely as such, but others of their fellow Subjects were sharers in their Burdens, and bare a part with them; This I readily grant. But withal I see not what service this can possibly do the Cause of Resistance; for it makes plainly against it, by shewing that the Christians might not have had their own strength only to rely upon in such a case, but might in all probability have had the assistance of such the Companions of their Sufferings, if they would have taken

(*a*) *Jul.* Imp. Fragm. Epist. Opp. *p.* 528.

taken upon them to begin a Rebellion, in order to the redreſs of theſe intolerable Grievances. If they had Power and Numbers ſufficient, or as S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks (*a*) *more than enough*, to defend themſelves without them, as I ſhall preſently prove they had, much more might they have hoped to do it with them. Yet neither the Miſeries they endured, nor their own Strength, nor the expectation of Help from theſe Auxiliaries, could tempt them to ſuch an unchriſtian Undertaking. On the contrary,

IV. They bare their many Hardſhips with a wonderful Calmneſs and Submiſſion, not ſuffering themſelves to be wearied out of their Temper, or their Duty, by all the terrible Encounters they ſo frequently met with. They had ſo great an abhorrence of the Imputation, much more of the Conſcience, of having acted contrary to the Principles of their Religion, though when perfectly beſides their own Intention and Thoughts, and when merely tricked into it, and without any apprehenſion of what they were doing, that they would chooſe rather to undergo any kind of Puniſhment, how grievous ſoever. As was viſible (*b*) in *Julian*'s Soldiers, who having been unwittingly betrayed into the Worſhip of the Heathen Gods, under the notion of doing Homage to the Emperor, were no ſooner convinced of their Error, but immediately they ran forth like Men beſides themſelves, profeſſing themſelves Chriſtians, and utterly diſclaiming what they had done, as a treacherous Impoſition upon them, and which had they been aware of, they would have loſt their Lives over and over, before they would have been brought to it, and begging Death as a juſt Reward of their Folly. And others who were attacked in a different manner, readily yielded to bear all that ſhould be laid upon them, with Reſignation and Patience, and a due regard, neither to part with their Religion nor their Loyalty, even to the

(*a*) Ad Demetrian.

(*b*) *Greg. Naz.* Orat. 3. adv. *Julian.* p. 83, 84, 85. & *Sozom.* Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 5. *c.* 17.

the (a) tiring of their hard-hearted Executioners. And which is the more remarkable, no Sex, or Age, State or Condition, but had their portion of these Tryals. And yet neither a concern for themselves, nor for their Wives and Children, could carry them beyond the Bounds prescribed by their Religion. (b) *Husbands and Wives, young Men and Maids, old Men and Women, Soldiers and private Persons, every Degree and Age, were Whipt, and Burnt, and slain with the Sword, and overcoming these Conflicts, τὸς στεφάνους ἀπειλήφασι, received their Crowns of Martyrdom.* Which they could never have hoped to attain to by Resistance. (c) *Military Men suffered themselves to be disbanded,* (d) *Wives were taken from their Husbands for the Emperor's Lust, and* (e) *Daughters from their Parents.* (f) *The Prisons that were designed for Murderers and Robbers of the Dead, were stuffed with Bishops, Priests and Deacons, together with others of inferiour Orders, till there was no room left for Malefactors:* (g) *Their Barns were shut up, their Granaries were secured, their Flocks and their Herds were wrested from them. Their* (h) *Scriptures were burnt.* (i) *Their Churches were demolished.* (k) *They had their Eyes put out, and their Hands and Feet cut off, and their Noses and Ears.* Such Pains, such Indignities, such Outrages of all sorts did they endure; which one would think, if any thing, would have tempted them to conspire together for their own and the Empire's Deliverance from such tyrannical and unmerciful Usage.

And

(a) Inter fatigatos carnifices. *Lactant. Instit.* l. 5. c. 13. Steterunt torti torquentibus fortiores; & pulsantes ac laniantes ungulas pulsata ac laniata membra vicerunt. *B. Cypr.* Epist. 10.

(b) *Euseb.* Hist. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 11. Omnis sexûs & ætatis homines ad exustionem rapti. *Lact. de mort. pers.* c. 15.

(c) *Tertull.* Apol. c. 2. *Lactant.* de mort. pers. *c.* 10. *Euseb.* l. 8. c. 4.

(d) Lact. *C.* 21. (e) Id. *c.* 8. & *c.* 38.

(f) *Euseb.* H. E. *l.* 8. *c.* 6. (g) *Lactant.* de m. *c.* 38.

(h) Id. *c.* 12. & *Euseb.* H. E. *l.* 8. *c.* 31.

(i) *Lact.* & *Euseb.* ibid. (k) *Lact.* c. 36.

And to add to the Terror of these Proceedings, multitudes of them suffered together, so many that one would have hoped their very Numbers might have created pity and compassion towards them. And they must necessarily have done it in others, as well as *Pliny* and *Trajan*, had not their Persecutors Hearts been like Adamants, or the nether *Milstone*. (*a*) *Sozomen* speaks of a vast number destroyed at once by *Sapores* in *Persia*; reckoning the Names of such as were known to amount to no less than 16000 Men and Women; but adding withal, that (*b*) the rest who suffered were innumerable. At other times such Crowds of them were made to undergo infinite Tortures, that according to (*c*) *Eusebius* it was impossible to recite their Sufferings. And if *Nicephorus* may be credited, (*d*) no fewer than Twenty Thousand were burnt together at *Nicomedia*, being assembled for the solemn Commemoration of our Lord's Nativity. Thus also speaks S. *Cyprian* of the Martyrs in his days. (*e*) *Now the Christian Martyrs are beyond numbring, according to that of the* (*f*) Apocalypse, *After this I beheld, and lo a great multitude which no Man could number, of all Nations, and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues, stood before the Throne, and before the Lamb, cloathed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands.* To the same purpose we have likewise the Testimony of *Gregory* the Great, (*g*) *Look Brethren, and see how the whole World is filled with Martyrs, so that we who can see it, are hardly so many, as we have known suffer for the Truth. God can count them up, but to us they seem to be multiplied beyond the Sand, and past computation, and not to be comprehended by us.* So says *Clemens Alexandrinus*, (*h*) *We have abundant Fountains of Martyrs every day, that are seen before our Eyes, of such as are Roasted, and Crucified, and Beheaded.* And *Eusebius* in several places relates, that in *Seve-*

(*a*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 2. *c.* 14.
(*b*) Τῶν δὲ ἐκτὸς τούτων πλῆθος ἀριθμῷ. ibid.
(*c*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 8. *c.* 6. (*d*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 7. *c.* 6.
(*e*) De exhort. Mart. *c.* 11. (*f*) *C.* 7. 9.
(*g*) In Evang. hom. 27. (*h*) Strom. *l.* 2. *p.* 480.

Severus's Perſecution, (*r*) *there were famous and celebrated Martyrdoms, but* Alexandria *had incomparably the greateſt plenty of them*, and (*a*) that *an almoſt infinite number were adorned with the Crown of Martyrdom.* And again under *Diocleſian*, he profeſſes That (*b*) *no Oratory or Eloquence can duly deſcribe the vaſt Numbers and undaunted Courage of the Martyrs of Chriſt, that ſuffered both in the Cities and in the Countries.* And *Lactantius* challenges any one to tell him what Beaſt could compare for brutiſhneſs and fierceneſs, with the Judges and other Officers into whoſe Hands the Chriſtians fell. *What* Caucaſus, ſays he, (*c*) *what* India, *what* Hyrcania *ever bred ſuch ſavage and blood-thirſty Beaſts? The Fury of all wild Beaſts terminates in the filling of their Bellies, and their Hunger being once ſatisfied is preſently allayed. But that is the true Beaſt, by whoſe bare command black Blood is every where poured forth, and which every where cauſes Mourning, Trembling, and Death in divers ſhapes. None can deſcribe the Rage of ſuch a Beaſt in its proper colours; which lies in one place, but tears with its iron Teeth in all places; and not only pulls Mens Limbs from each other, but breaks their very Bones, and reduces them to Aſhes, that ſo they may have no place of Burial allowed them.* I preſume Mr. *H.* will not reckon ſuch Monſters of Cruelty, Violence, and barbarous Inhumanity, by whoſe Command theſe horrid Abuſes were acted, amongſt thoſe few good Governors, to whom alone he teaches Submiſſion and Obedience to be due. Yet as exceſſively outrageous as they ſhewed themſelves to be, theſe holy Servants of God looked upon them as his Ordinance, and quietly and contentedly ſubmitted to them as ſuch.

But above all, the famed inſtance of the *Thebean* Legion ſuffering at *Agaunum*, now S. *Maurice*, in *Savoy*, if the truth of the (*d*) relation may be depended upon, is a moſt gloriouſly memorable Teſtimony to both Religion and Loyalty at the ſame time. For what could poſſibly

(*r*) H. E. *l.* 6. *c.* 1. (*a*) *C.* 2. (*b*) *L.* 8. *c.* 4.
(*c*) Inſtit. *l.* 5. *c.* 11.
(*d*) Ab Eucher. Lugdun. ſcript. apud Surium, ad diem 22 Septembris.

possibly be a more demonstrative Evidence of an invincible Zeal for both, than that a whole Legion, consisting almost of seven Thousand valiant and well appointed Soldiers should yield themselves, to be butchered one after another, without striking a Stroke in their own Defence, rather than incur either the Guilt of Idolatry against God, or of Resistance against their Prince? Or what good Christian would not heartily admire the Courage and Constancy, and herewith the Fidelity and Loyalty of *Mauritius* the General, encouraging the rest after the first Decimation, in these Words: "I congratulate your Valour and your Constancy, most worthy "Fellow-Soldiers, that the Commands of *Cæsar* have "not been more prevalent with you, than the Love of "your Religion. You have beheld your Brethren joyfully undergoing a glorious Death. But with what "fear was I struck hereupon, lest being armed as ye "are, any one amongst you should, under the notion "of Defence, have sought to prevent these most happy "Funerals! I had before my Eyes, as an effectual Antidote against any such unwarrantable attempt, the "Example of our Blessed Lord, commanding his Apostle S. *Peter, to put up his Sword into its sheath*, hereby teaching a Christian Reliance upon God, to be "preferable to all the help of our Weapons; with more "to the same purpose: Or the correspondent Meekness and good Disposition of the Soldiers in returning this answer to *Maximian*, "We are your Soldiers, O Cæsar, "who have listed ourselves for the Defence of the Empire, and never deserted our Station, nor betrayed "our Trust, nor incurred the Charge of Negligence, or "Cowardise. Nor would we ever scruple to obey "your Commands, did they not interfere with the "Laws of our Religion, which have condemned the Worship of Devils, and your polluted Altars. We are "surprized to find an Order from you, that the "Christians must either defile themselves with your "sacrilegious Offerings, or be terrified with a Decimation. However, to prevent your taking upon "yourself the trouble of enquiring, who amongst us

" are Christians, we here assure you we are all such; " and all our Bodies are at your disposal, but our Souls " are Christ's, and out of your power: Or that of *Exuperius* the Ensign, " Despair, which is most pres- " sing in dangers, has not armed us against thee, O " Emperor, for though we have our Arms in readiness, " we will not Resist thee, for we had much rather be " slain than overcome, esteeming it far better to dye " innocent, than live with guilt upon us." Such a fear of God are they said to have had upon their Minds, and in a full persuasion of the Truth of his Promises, *were put to the Sword* one after another, *without Resisting*. A plainer, fuller Instance of the *Faith and Patience* of these *Saints* could not be desired, provided the account we have of them be true. As it has been thought to be by very great Men, and as good Judges of a matter of this nature, as any in their time; such as (*a*) *Grotius* abroad, and at home Archbishop (*b*) *Usher*, Bishop (*c*.) *Ward*, Bishop (*c*) *Stillingfleet*, Dr. (*d*) *Cave*, Dr. (*e*) *Hickes*, Dr. (*f*) *Falkener*, &c. Yet because Mr. *Dubourdieu*'s *Historical Dissertation*, wherein he endeavours to prove it fabulous, has never yet been answered that I know of, and I have not time to examine it at present, I shall therefore make no other use of it, than to infer that supposing it a Forgery, before the time of *Eucherius Lugdunensis*, from whom we first had it, it is highly reasonable to believe that whosoever forged it, would be sure to accommodate his Forgery, as much as might be, to the Notions and Practices of the Times wherein he did it, and not set abroad so improbable a Story, as every one at the first hearing must needs know, to have nothing of Truth, or so much as Verisimilitude in it. Nor is it to be imagined, that one of *Eucherius*'s Character and Station, would

(*a*) De jur. B. ac P. *l.* 1. *c.* 4.
(*b*) *Of the Power of the Prince*, &c. *p.* 219.
(*c.*) *Serm.* 1. *p.* 33. (*c*) *Antiq. of the Brit. Churches.* ch. 2.
(*d*) *Prim. Christianity.* Part. 3. ch. 4. & Hist. liter. in *Eucherii* Opp.
(*e*) *Serm. before the Lord Mayor*, Jan. 30. 1681-2.
(*f*) *Christian Loyalty.* B. 2. ch. 4. sect. 3.

would have undertaken to transmit the Memory of this illustrious Occurrence to Posterity, if the Contrivance of it, as well as the Evidence for it, had not carried with it an air of Truth.

But there is less pretence of Exception to that of *Palladius*, concerning the State of the Christians under *Arcadius*, and the Reason given of their Sufferings, That (*a*) when the Emperor observing a great number of them together, almost three Thousand, of new baptized Converts, and being told by some of their back-friends, that they were Hereticks, a Party were sent to apprehend their Teachers, and disperse the rest, and some of both sorts were actually seized, and hereupon Enquiry came to be made, how it could be that 3000 of them should tamely suffer their Assembly to be secured by a few Soldiers? The Return made to this Enquiry was, *That this neither shewed want of Strength, nor of Zeal to save themselves, but proceeded purely from the Influence their Religion had upon them, and the Industry of their Teachers incessantly instilling into them Principles of Peace. Nor was it reasonable*, says *Theodorus*, one of the Dialogists in that Life, *that those whom S.* Chrysostom *had taught Prudence and Meekness, should defend themselves in a foolish tumultuous manner.* Their Principles were against all Resistance *of the Higher Powers*, though cruel persecuting Powers, such as the Apostles lived and wrote under, and their Behaviour was very agreeable hereto. Insomuch that they would choose to endure the worst of Treatments, rather than attempt to preserve themselves, by such means as they well knew to be inconsistent with the Precepts of Christianity. Thus did the Christians of those Times glorify God by a patient Submission to whatever Evils it pleased his Divine Wisdom to bring upon them, by means of their unkind and merciless Sovereigns, without quarreling at the Instruments he made use of, for bringing these Evils upon them.

(*a*) De vit. S. Jo. Chrysost. c. 9.
See Dr Cave's Life of St Chrysost. p. 496.

V. And this they did, not only when they were weak and unable to help themſelves, but when greatly multiplied, and in all appearance capacitated to withſtand whatever Forces ſhould be brought againſt them. Thus much may fairly be inferred from what I have offered under the laſt head; and the Reader muſt be in a good meaſure ſatisfied of it already. For if there were ſuch Multitudes that from time to time ſuffered for the ſake of Chriſt, their Strength and Power muſt needs be anſwerable to their Numbers, and conſequently very formidable, had they been at liberty to ſhew what they could do. But however I have other, and more direct and poſitive Proof of this Truth.

And the firſt Evidence I ſhall produce is of one already named, no Chriſtian, but a Perſecutor of them under *Trajan*, though both more pitiful and compaſſionate to them than other Perſecutors, I mean *Pliny*, who in (*a*) the forecited famous Epiſtle to the Emperor informs him, not only what great Numbers had ſuffered, and were ſtill ready to ſuffer the utmoſt Extremities, rather than ſacrifice to the *Roman* Deities, nor only that they had overſpread the whole Country, but moreover they had filled all places to that degree, that the Heatheniſh *Temples had been almoſt quite forſaken, ſo that they had been forced to forbear their wonted Solemnities.* Which muſt imply the Chriſtians to be far the major part of the People at that time, at leaſt in *Bithynia* where he preſided, and from whence he wrote. And this is a Teſtimony that well deſerves to be attended to. For if we could ſuppoſe the Chriſtian Writers to have been partial in their Repreſentations, and to have magnified their own Strength beyond its due proportion, which yet is not eaſily to be ſuppoſed, conſidering not only their own Integrity and Sincerity, but to whom they addreſſed their Apologies, and how eaſily they might have been confuted if what they ſaid had not been true; ſuppoſing, I ſay, they had been ſo falſe and fooliſh together, it cannot be imagined that *Pliny* ſhould have

(*a*) *L.* 10. *Ep.* 97.

have been under the same Byass, but what he has related concerning them must needs be allowed for Truth. And if so, their Strength appears to have been very considerable, and such as would have tempted many others in the like hard circumstances, to behave themselves very differently to their Governors, from what these always did. But let us hear the Christians speaking of themselves.

Eusebius is positive as to both their Numbers and their Extent, giving us hereby to understand how little reason there is to imagine them so thinly sown as that they might not have promised themselves good hope of success in an Insurrection. For speaking of our Blessed Saviour, (*a*) he adds, That *his saving Word like a Sun-beam enlightned the whole World, the Sound of the Holy Evangelists and Apostles going out, as had been foretold of them in the Holy Scriptures, into all Lands, and their Speech unto the Ends of the Earth. So that throughout all Cities and Villages sprang up Churches, abounding with an immense Multitude of Believers.*

And *Tertullian* notes it as a common Complaint in his days, that they were exceedingly increased, and were like to be yet more so. (*b*) *Obsessam vociferantur civitatem, &c. They*, their Enemies, *cry out that the City is invested by them, and that they abound in the Countries, in the Castles, in the Isles; and it is sadly lamented* as a woful Misfortune, *that all Sexes, Ages, States, and Conditions went over to them.* And again, the same *Tertullian* professes, That (*c*) *in one Night's time they could have sufficiently revenged themselves upon their Persecutors, if they had been permitted to return Evil for Evil.* And he desires the Governors to bethink themselves, Whether such a powerful Body as the Christians then were, might not have stood upon their own Defence, and whether they had not force enough, not only for surprizing their Enemies by clandestine Conspiracies, and sudden and unexpected Assaults, but for engaging them openly in

(*a*) Hist. Eccl. *l.* 2. *c.* 3.
(*b*) Apol. *c.* 1. (*c*) *C.* 37.

the Field of Battle; adding farther that all places were ſtuffed and crouded with them, ſo numerous were they grown in a little time; beſides that the little regard that they had for their own Lives, gave them the more power over thoſe of others. As I ſhall have occaſion to obſerve ſomewhat more particularly, when I come to enquire into Mr. *H*'s. Exceptions againſt the irrefragable Teſtimony of *Tertullian*, in behalf of the Doctrine I am contending for. And in his Addreſs to *Scapula*, (*a*) He atteſts the Chriſtians to be *almoſt the greater part of every City, and of each Sex, every Age, and all Degrees, the higheſt and next under the Emperor himſelf not excepted.*

Whereto agrees what *Juſtin Martyr* urges againſt *Trypho*, (*b*) That there was *no ſort of People, Barbarians, or* Greeks, *or of whatſoever denomination, not* Hamaxobii, *the* Nomades, *or of ſuch as* had no Houſes, *but dwelt in Tents only, that did not offer up their Praiſes and Thankſgivings to the Father and Maker of all things, through the Name of the* crucified Jeſus.

And S. *Cyprian* ſpeaks full to our purpoſe, in his Addreſs to *Demetrian* Proconſul of *Africa*. (*c*) *Leave off abuſing the Servants of God and Chriſt, with thy Perſecutions, whom, after all the miſchief thou canſt do to them, the Divine Vengeance will protect. For this reaſon it is that when apprehended, none of us makes Oppoſitions, nor revenges himſelf upon your unjuſt Violence*, quamvis nimius & copioſus noſter ſit populus, *though we are more than enough, a ſtrong and powerful Body*; hereby intimating to him their Ability to deal with him, if they had not been reſtrained from it.

Thus likewiſe ſays *Lactantius*, (*d*) From Eaſt to Weſt, *from the riſing to the ſetting Sun, the Divine Law is received; and each Sex, as well as every Age, People and Nation, ſerve God with one and the ſame Mind, and every where is the ſame Patience, and the ſame Contempt of Death.* Whence it naturally follows, that though Chriſtianity had thus wonderfully overſpread the face of the Earth, their

(*a*) Ad Scap. *c.* 2. (*b*) *P.* 345. (*c*) *P.* 192.
(*d*) Inſt. *l.* 5. *c.* 13.

their Numbers and Strength were no encouragement to them, to ſtand up forcibly for themſelves againſt their mercileſs Governors. Whom becauſe they knew it not lawful to oppoſe, they choſe rather to dye with Patience and Reſignation to the Divine Will, than take upon them to right themſelves againſt his Miniſters, how unworthy ſoever of that high Office.

The ſame is taught alſo by S. *Auguſtin*, delivering it as an undoubted Truth, That (*a*) *the City of God, though dwelling like Strangers upon Earth, and having vaſt Stores of People on their ſide, nevertheleſs would not fight againſt their wicked perſecuting Princes for their temporal Safety, but rather abſtained from all Reſiſtance, in order to a ſtate of eternal Happineſs, and ſubmitted to be put in Chains, Impriſoned, Beaten, Tortured, Burnt, Butchered, and Slain.* On which Words *Ludovicus Vives* thus comments. *They were in a condition to have made head againſt their Enemies, and if they would have betaken themſelves to Arms and ſtood upon their Defence, might not only have terrified, but brought them into danger. But they accounted it far better, and more becoming the Profeſſors of the Goſpel, to Suffer than to do any Injury, to be Killed than Kill, to loſe their Bodies than their Souls.*

But the fulleſt Inſtance I know to this purpoſe is of *Julian*'s Army. I dare ſay Mr. *H.* will not reckon this Apoſtate amongſt thoſe good Governors, whom he allows to have God's Authority, and a Right to their Subjects Obedience upon this account. Yet his Chriſtian Soldiers not only fought for him againſt his Enemies, but owned themſelves bound to be ſubject to, and obey him, out of a Principle of religious Loyalty, and becauſe of the Power he had received from God. They ſerved him faithfully, and were ready to go upon any Expedition he ordered them. And when any of them were condemned to ſuffer for their Religion, they did it as readily, as if they could no way have prevented it. And yet what their Strength and Ability was, appears evidently from their confeſſion to *Jovian*, upon his coming

(*a*) De civ. Dei. *l.* 22. *c.* 6.

ing to the Crown, That they were all of the same Religion with himself. They heard him, when chosen Emperor upon the death of *Julian*, refuse to accept of that Dignity, (*a*) because being a *Christian*, he knew not how to take upon him the Command of a Heathen Army. But they soon removed this difficulty, assuring him this was no cause of Refusal, for he might depend upon it, they were not what he supposed them to be, but were ALL CHRISTIANS as well as himself. *Fear not, O Emperor*, say they, *nor reject the Command over us, upon account of our Impiety. For you will have Christians for your Subjects, who have been educated in the Doctrines of the True Religion.* As Mr. *H.* might have seen in the Authors themselves; or nearer at hand in the learned Dr. *Hickes*'s Preface to his unanswerable *Jovian*. Yet had these same Christians served under the Apostate *Julian*, when they had it every day in their power, to rid themselves of him. Though he was an (*b*) Apostate, and a Tyrant, an irreconcilable Enemy to, and Persecutor of Christianity; (*c*) and *as he was later in time, so was more intolerable in his Persecutions, than either* Diocletian *who began to fall foul upon the Christians, or* Maximian *who followed and exceeded him, or* Maximin, *who as he came after, so he surpassed them both in Cruelty.* So that says *Gregory Nazianzen*, (*d*) *he might justly be called* Jeroboam, *or* Ahab, *or* Pharaoh, *or* Nebuchadnezzar, *or all of them together, as having the Apostacy of the one, the Blood-guiltiness of the next, the Hardheartedness of the third, and the Sacrilege of the last.* He was in S. *Chrysostom*'s language, (*e*) Βασιλεὺς ἀσεβείᾳ νικήσας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν ἅπαντας, *a greater instance of Impiety than all the Emperors that had been before him.* Yet all the while his Army had such a sense of their Duty to him as their Sovereign, that all this did

(*a*) Socrat. Hist. Eccl. *l.* 3. *c.* 22. Sozom. *l.* 6. *c.* 3. Theodorit. *l.* 4. *c.* 1.

(*b*) Julianus extitit infidelis Imperator, nonne extitit Apostata, iniquus, Idololatra? *B.* Aug. *in* Psalm. 124.

(*c*) Greg. Naz. *in* Jul. *Orat.* 3. *p.* 93.

(*d*) *Orat.* 4. *p.* 110.

(*e*) Orat. in Juvent. & Max. *To.* 5. *p.* 533.

did not hinder them from being faithful and obedient, and ready to fulfil all his juſt and lawful Orders and Commands. (*a*) *When he would have them violate the Laws of their Bleſſed Saviour, they ſtuck to their Religion, and acknowledged no Lord in that caſe, but him who is in Heaven; when he required them to worſhip Idols, and offer Incenſe, they ſhewed themſelves to ſtand in greater awe of God, than of him. But when he bade them lead forth the Army, and go againſt ſuch or ſuch a Nation, they forthwith obeyed. They knew how to diſtinguiſh between their Eternal, and their Temporal Lord, and yet were ſubject to their Temporal Lord for the ſake of him that is Eternal.* They remembred the relation that, notwithſtanding all his Wickedneſs and ill Government, he yet bare to Almighty God, as appointed to Govern under him, and upon this account thought themſelves obliged to honour and be ſubject to him, and not to requite his unconſcionable Uſage of them, by an undutiful Behaviour towards him.

If Reſiſtance were lawful in any caſe, as Sir *Dudley Diggs* well argues, (*b*) *never Men could have brought fairer Pleas.* Julian *was an Apoſtate from the Eſtabliſhed True Religion, he dealt with Sorcerers and Magicians, and profeſſed againſt doing juſtice to the Chriſtians, making ſport with their Injuries, and returning no other anſwer to their Tears and humble Petitions, but ſuch Scoffs as theſe*; " It is " part of your Religion to be abuſed; you forget the " *Galilean's* Precept, *Why do you not rather ſuffer Wrong?* " You muſt forgive all Offences againſt you, as you " hope to be forgiven; if they ſtrike you on one Cheek, " you are bound to turn the other alſo; if they take " away your Cloaks, that gives them a juſt title to " your Coats too; if at leaſt he whom you worſhip have " power to diſpoſe of your Goods, you are bound from " going to Law, and rendring Evil for Evil; why do " you petition againſt, who are bound to pray for your " Perſecutors? If they take away your Revenues, they " ad-

(*a*) *B.* Aug. *in* Pſalm. 124.
(*b*) *Unlawfulneſs of Subjects taking up Arms*, p. 102.

" advance you into the State of Perfection, which re-
" quires you should not possess any thing, *&c.*" *Thus they were more persecuted by his Wit than his Cruelty; and though he did even wanton in their Miseries, his barbarous Usage could not prevail with them to neglect their Calling, but they committed themselves to him who judgeth righteously; and he revenged their causeless Sufferings, in his destruction; for as stricken from Heaven, he cryed out,* O Galilean, *Thou hast got the better.*

So that we may justly conclude with Dr. *Hickes* in his learned *Jovian*, (*a*) That *there never were greater Examples of Passive-obedience, than in this short Reign of* Julian, *whose Christian Subjects and Soldiers, tho' far more numerous than in any Age before them, not only patiently endured many grievous Miseries, but, what was the most provoking and grievous of all Miseries, they daily heard and saw themselves, their Religion, and their blessed Saviour, most blasphemously scorned and reviled.* Though *he was an Apostate that was their Persecutor*, and they had their Religion like a Treasure wrested out of their Hands, by one that had been bred in the Bosom of the Church, *yet all the Armour they used against him* were the old primitive Arms of Prayers and Tears. (*b*) *It seems neither the Defence of their Laws, nor Religion, nor Fellow-Christians, nor the preventing the Effusion of Innocent Blood, could make them Resist the worst of Tyrants.* (*c*) *He knew they would rather dye than Resist him; he knew that Passive-obedience was their Principle, and this made him so secure of them, and so bold to abuse them, their Religion, and their Saviour, although they were so numerous, that* (*d*) *the Magistrates in every City, were scarce able to take the numbers of those that refused to sacrifice.* The truth is, they had such a sense of their Duty impressed upon their Minds, that all the vilest Treatment could not withdraw them from it. Neither Scoffs nor Frowns, Jeers nor Torments, could inspire them with any thoughts of Rebelling against the Lord's Anointed, how outrageous soever in his carriage towards them.

(*a*) P. 176. (*b*) P. 180. (*c*) P. 183.
(*d*) Sozom. *l.* 5. *c.* 15. & Socrat. *l.* 3. *c.* 20.

them. They were for Suffering rather than Sinning, not only under the foreſt Provocations, but the moſt promiſing Temptations. And as at other times, ſo particularly, as Biſhop *Bilſon* obſerves of them to their immortal Honour, (*a*) when they had this inſulting Emperor in his Voyage againſt the *Perſians*, far from home, and from any that might aſſiſt and defend him, and were ſo much ſtronger than he, that they could immediately *have done with him whatever they would, yet they choſe rather to ſpend their Lives for him, than lift up their Hands againſt him. And the Chriſtian World in his abſence ſtirred not againſt him, but with Patience endured his Oppreſſion, and with Silence expected his Return.*

The like he obſerves alſo of *Valens*, (*b*) That *againſt him the Church of Chriſt had Forces abundant, if ſhe would have ſounded or uſed them. For all the time of his Reign, not only the Weſt-Empire were Catholicks, firſt* Valentinian, *and after him* Gratian ; *but* Procopius *at* Conſtantinople, *taking Arms againſt* Valens, *and the* Goths *detaining all* Thracia *from him, gave the Chriſtians great advantage to have ſhaken him clean out of the Eaſt-Empire , if their Wills had been anſwerable unto their Strength.*

So that none who traces theſe ancient Chriſtians from time to time, and compares their Strength and their Behaviour together, but muſt be ſenſible, that no Pretence can be more vain and groundleſs, than that of *Bellarmine*, and others ſince, That (*c*) *the only reaſon why the Chriſtians did not heretofore depoſe* Nero, *and* Diocleſian, *and* Julian *the Apoſtate, and* Valens *the* Arian, *and others like them , was their want of Power to do it.* For hereby it is undeniable, that they were very ſtrong, and had beſides ſometimes ſuch convenient opportunities of delivering themſelves out of the Hands of their perſecuting Princes, that nothing but a ſenſe of their Duty could withhold them from it. They had overſpread the Empire, had extended themſelves from Eaſt to Weſt, had emptied the idolatrous Temples, had liſted themſelves

(*a*) *Of Chriſtian Subjection.* Part. 3. p. 404. (*b*.) Ibid.
(*c*) Id fecit quia deerant vires temporales Chriſtianis. *Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif.* l. 5. c. 7.

ſelves in the Army, and got into Poſts of Command, and had the Emperor upon ſome occaſions, as much at their diſpoſal, as *David* had *Saul* in his, *either* (*a*) *at the Cave at* Engedi, or (*b*) in the Wilderneſs of *Ziph*. And if it was not yet in their power to make ſure of him, if they durſt have attempted it, it is impoſſible to tell how it ever could be.

VI. And *laſtly*, If it be objected, that it were poſſible, though they be allowed to have had Strength, and preſumed to have had good Will enough to Reſiſt, they might yet forbear for want of ſome to head them, ſo as that they might hope for a probability at leaſt, of ſucceſs in ſuch an Attempt; to this I anſwer, That whatſoever poſſibility might be of this, it is very far from being a true ſtate of the caſe. For they had ſuch ſometimes in Arms, as would have been heartily glad of their Aſſiſtance, and would no doubt have given them all the Encouragement they could well deſire. Such was *Procopius* at *Conſtantinople*, *in the Reign of* Valens, juſt now mentioned. And ſuch likewiſe had been (*c*) *Clodius Albinus* in *France*, and (*d*) *Peſcennius*, or *Peſcenninus Niger*, ſet up by the *Syrian* Legions, both of them in the Reign of *Severus*; and (*e*) *Auſidius*, or *Avidius Caſſius*, in the time of *Marcus Antoninus* in *Syria*. All who having raiſed Commotions in the Empire, it cannot be thought but they would have been glad of all the Help they could get againſt the Emperor. So that had the Chriſtians had any inclination to Rebell, they could never have hoped for a fitter opportunity, than when they ſaw any of theſe already in Arms. And their Strength added to the Forces already engaged under ſuch experienced Leaders, could not fail in all human appearance, to ſet them free from their preſent Grievances, and poſſibly to lay a laſting foundation of Eaſe

(*a*) 1 Sam. 24. 3, 4. (*b*) *Ch.* 26. 7.

(*c*) Jul. Capitolin. in Clod. Alb. & Æl. Spartian. in Peſcenn. Nigro.

(*d*) Aurel. Vict. Epit. & Pamel. in Tertull. ad Scap. *c.* 2.

(*e*) Vulcat. in vit. Av. Caſſ. Xiphil. in Marc. Anton. Philoſ. & Jul. Capitolin. in Caſſ.

Eaſe and Quiet to their Poſterity after them. Yet notwithſtanding whatſoever proſpect of this nature they might have, *Tertullian* glories in it as an undeniable Evidence of their ſteady Fidelity to their Princes, that they ſtruck in with none of theſe movers of Rebellion. He boaſts in his eloquent Apology for them, (*a*) That the *Caſſiuſes*, *Nigers*, and *Albinuſes* were not from among them. And pleads in their Juſtification before the Prefect *Scapula*, (*b*) That no Chriſtians were ever found to be Accomplices with their Followers; That they had no *Nigrians*, *Albinians*, or *Caſſians* amongſt the Profeſſors of the Goſpel. No, under all their heavieſt Preſſures, and the worſt Uſage they received; and not only ſo, but under their moſt encouraging Temptations to Reſiſtance, they were alway mindful of their Duty. They conſidered that they were Chriſtians, and accordingly ſtood bound to follow their Saviour's Precepts and Example. Hence they conſtantly choſe rather to expoſe themſelves to the utmoſt Barbarities, than take any undue and unlawful courſe to right themſelves; as they knew that of Reſiſting the Higher Powers to be.

Nor were theſe all the Commanders they might have promiſed themſelves to head them in an Inſurrection, could they have believed it lawful; but as Dr. *Hickes* well argues, (*c*) They might have had others from amongſt themſelves, Men of Intereſt, Experience, and Courage: for, *beſides the open and concealed Chriſtians that were in* Julian's *Army, there were many great and popular Men among the Legions turned out of their Employments, as* Jovian, Valentinian, *and* Valens, *who might have ſet up the Holy Standard, which* Julian *had taken down, and ſoon have got an Army of Chriſtians, if* Julian's *Chriſtian Soldiers or Subjects, barbarouſly uſed as they were, had thought it lawful to Rebell. The two former eſpecially had ſuch intereſt in* Julian's *own Army, that they were ſucceſſively choſen Emperors by it, within eight Months after his Death; and conſidering how ſpitefully the whole Chriſtian Clergy had been uſed by* Julian, *the Chriſtians outraged by the Heathens, the Chriſtian*

(*a*) C. 35. (*b*) Ad Scap. *c.* 2. (*c*) Jovian. *p.* 171, 172.

Christian Soldiers discontented, so many Christian Cities disfranchised, and such brave and noble Commanders to head the numberless Sufferers of all sorts, it is most absurd to ascribe their peaceable and suffering Behaviour to want of Strength, Numbers, or Opportunity; and difficult to imagine, had they thought Resistance lawful, but that having all these advantages, they should at least have attempted to Rebell. It were hard indeed to apprehend, how they should be able to restrain themselves from seeking to cast off their Yoke, and should so patiently acquiesce under it, had it not proceeded from the Principles of their Religion. And it will be impossible to give any other tolerable account of it, but that their Minds were set upon another better Life, which they were unwilling in any wise to endanger, for the sake of this World's Ease or Security, whether Personal or Social.

Thus I have shewn somewhat more largely than I at first designed, how exemplary the Patience, Submission, and Obedience of the primitive Christians was, and how unlike theirs who both teach and practice Resistance of Authority, when they apprehend it to be for their temporal Safety and Advantage. These Blessed Saints, taught them to fear their Sovereign as God's Ordinance, and as reigning by his Commission, and not to Revile or Reproach him, much less forcibly oppose him, but Honour and be subject to him, and observe all his Lawful Commands, praying for him, and desiring his Welfare, and choosing much rather to dye by the Magistrate's Order, and in obedience to their Saviour's Laws, and the Injunctions of his Apostles, than to save their Lives by the use of forbidden means. They exhorted their Fellow-Christians to keep in mind the Apostle's Admonition about *studying to be Quiet*, and to raise no Tumults amongst their Brethren, but always prefer a Crown of Martyrdom abundantly before the utmost earthly Happiness. They declared their Sovereign to have God's Commission, and to be next under God, and by consequence accountable to Him only, and not to any, or all of the People, who being but Subjects, could have no Authority over him to whom the supreme Lord of all had put them in subjection.

They

They owned Religion was to be defended; yet not by Fighting, but by Dying for it. And when they ſuffered to the greateſt degree, they contented themſelves only to commit their Cauſe to God, and leave it to his infinitely Wiſe Determination. They underſtood their Religion too well to think, that becauſe their Prince tranſgreſſed his Duty towards them, they might alſo tranſgreſs theirs towards him; becauſe he had abuſed, and oppreſſed them, they might take up Arms againſt him; becauſe he had invaded their Rights, they might Depoſe him, and rob him of his. This is a ſort of Caſuiſtry that might befit a *Bellarmine*, a *Doleman*, a *Creſwell*, or a *Milton*, a *Johnſon*, a *Toland*, or a *Locke*; but was utterly unknown to the *Tertullians*, the *Cyprians*, the *Chryſoſtoms*, and the *Auguſtins*, and all the Writers of the firſt and pureſt Ages of the Church. Theſe did not imagine any Wickedneſs of their Sovereign would authorize them to be wicked too; that his Injuring them would juſtify their Injuring him; or that becauſe he ſhewed himſelf a Tyrant, they might therefore be Traytors or Rebels. They profeſſed their only Weapons againſt their Superiours to be *Prayers* and *Tears*; and that whoſoever *Reſiſts the Higher Powers*, fights againſt God, who has enjoined Obedience to them.

And as their Doctrines were thus for Submiſſion and Non-reſiſtance in all caſes, ſo were their Practices accordingly; as all that are any ways acquainted with the Hiſtory of thoſe Times muſt be forced to acknowledge. For as they *made Prayers, Supplications, Interceſſions, and Giving of Thanks for Kings and all in Authority*, ſo did they patiently bear with the harſheſt Uſage they met with from them.

When they were ſtript of their Honours and Privileges, were Whipt, were Beaten, had their Fleſh harrowed and torn, their Limbs upon the Rack, their whole Bodies upon the Gridiron, or in the Fire, were Impriſoned, put in Chains, Crucified, devoured by Beaſts, were Thrown headlong, Drowned, Pulled in pieces, ſent into Exile, or condemned to the Mines, were Starved, Hung up, Beheaded; when they underwent theſe, and

and divers other the moſt horrid ſorts of Puniſhments, and not for any Crimes they were guilty of, but merely upon the account of their Religion, and not only according to Law, but many times directly againſt it, they were far from permitting them all to tranſport them beyond their Duty. All this and a great deal more they patiently ſubmitted to, and many times againſt all pretence of Law, as well as Juſtice, and when great Numbers of them ſuffered together, and moreover when they had ſtrength enough to have prevented it, and the moſt favourable opportunities and advantages for ſuch a deſign, if they had not been tied up by the Laws of the Goſpel, forbidding all Attempts upon their Princes, as highly diſpleaſing to Almighty God, and of pernicious and deſtructive conſequence to themſelves, not improbably in this, but moſt certainly in the other World. Thus *by Faith and Patience they inherited the Promiſes.* A method, which as Dr. *Hammond* well obſerves, (*a*) is *moſt irreconcilable with forcible Reſiſtance.* And the Goſpel has never preſcribed us a different behaviour under Trials and Sufferings, from what it did to them. As I am next to ſhew.

SECT. III.

What Obligation we are under to the Paſſive Imitation of theſe Devout and Heavenlyminded Chriſtians.

THAT we are all to be *Followers of them as they were,* not only *of S. Paul,* and the other Apoſtles, but *of Chriſt* himſelf, is what no good Chriſtian can deny. And that they were thus *Followers of Chriſt,* is plain from their ſuffering after his Example, and in obedience to his Command; who has himſelf enjoined *to render to* Cæſar *the things that be* Cæſar's, and by his Apoſtle has threatned *Damnation* to ſuch *as Reſiſt the Higher Powers.* This I have ſo fully proved in the former Chapter, that I ſhall not need to inſiſt upon it here. All there-

(*a*) *Of Reſiſting the Lawful Magiſtrate.* p. 304.

therefore [redacted] design in this place is briefly to observe,

I. In what sense they understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the point of Resistance.

II. What indispensable Obligation they thought themselves under to behave themselves accordingly.

III. How loudly the Pattern they have set us calls for an undaunted Imitation of them.

I. In what sense they understood the Doctrine of the Scriptures as to the point of Resistance. Now had they thought it lawful to Resist in any case, their Provocations to it were neither so rare, nor so light, but that it may rationally be presumed, they would have been sometimes at least, if not frequently in Arms, to try what Relief they could give themselves, against the many Pressures they groaned under, and Dangers whereto they were exposed. It might have been expected likewise that they would have encouraged others to the like Attempts, or at least would have been sure to vindicate their own Principles, and shew the rest of the World, that they had no reason to believe *an unlimited Subjection* to be *due* to Princes, as well when they go contrary to, as when they *answer the good End of their Institution*. It could not be, upon this supposition, but some of them would, at some time or other, have published their Sentiments, for the Instruction and Satisfaction of others, as well as to justify themselves; namely, *That if those who are placed in Authority for the Good and Happiness of Mankind, use their Power to any other purpose, to the Hurt and Prejudice of Human Society, to oppose them in such a case cannot be to oppose the Authority of God. Nay a Passive Non-resistance would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* This is (*a*) Mr. *H*'s, Doctrine, and would no doubt have been the Doctrine too of these Christian Worthies, if they had interpreted the Words of our Saviour, and his Apostles, to as odd a sense as he does. But they *had not so learned Christ*. They thought

(*a*) *Measures of Submission.* p. 8.

it neceſſary to take the Words of Scripture in their moſt genuine Meaning, and not preſs them to ſerve an Hypotheſis, how plauſible ſoever any might apprehend it in order to the peace and quiet of this Life. They knew the Old Teſtament had condemned all Diſobedience to, and Reſiſtance of Authority, or ſo much as to Revile, or but wiſh Harm to Governors; and that the New had taught *to be ſubject to Principalities and Powers, and obey Magiſtrates* in general, the Bad as well as the Good, the Wicked as well as the Righteous, with a Reſervation indeed for Non-compliance with their ſinful and unjuſt Commands, but with none for Reſiſtance in caſe they *attended not continually*, as they ought, *to that very thing* for which they were ſet in ſuch high Station, nor even when they *acted contrary to the End of their Inſtitution, invaded the Rights of their Subjects, and attempted the Ruin of the Society over which they were placed*. For which reaſon they could by no means go about to perſuade the World, that the ſole End of Government was the *Good and Happineſs of Society, and when Princes act contrary to this*, and ſo *deflect from God's Will, which is declared to be the promoting the Publick Good, they loſe their title to the Apoſtle S.* Paul's *Declarations, and are no longer to be looked upon as the Ordinance of God*. Search all their Writings, their Epiſtles, their Apologies, their Commentaries, their Devotional, Catechetical, Controverſial Diſcourſes, their Sermons, their Hiſtories, their Councils, ſearch all theſe from the beginning to the end, and from one Age to another, as far as I have undertaken to trace their Steps, and it may be farther, and you will never find any thing like this; but on the contrary, they were all Patience and Subjection, and own their Religion to be a Suffering Religion, and themſelves prepared accordingly *to enter through many Tribulations into the Kingdom of Heaven*. They never gave out, that the *Divine Authority of Magiſtrates, and the Uſefulneſs of their Office to Human Society, were not really two diſtinct Arguments, for enforcing the Duty of Submiſſion to Governors*, or that *S.* Paul *reſolves all into the latter*. But when he told them, *there was no Power but of God, and the Powers that*

were,

were, were ordained of God, and for this reaſon *whoſoever reſiſted the Power*, by ſo doing *reſiſted the Ordinance of God*, and without a timely and ſincere Repentance muſt expect to be *Damned* for it, they verily believed he meant as the Words import, and as every impartial Reader muſt neceſſarily underſtand them to mean, That Magiſtracy is to be ſubmitted to, not only upon account of its *Uſefulneſs to Society*, but as it is *God's Ordinance*, and bears his Stamp and Impreſſion, and cannot therefore be ſlighted and diſobeyed without an apparent Breach of his Command, and incurring the Guilt and Danger of Diſobedience to his Authority. Hence all their Writings treat only of Submiſſion and Patience, and Reſignation to the Divine Will, even under the courſeſt Uſage, and the heavieſt Preſſures and Calamities, without any intimation of the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance, or any encouragement *for Subjects to conſult* the ſuppoſed temporal *Happineſs of the Publick, and of their Poſterity after them, by Oppoſing ſuch Governors.* As Mr. *H.* muſt be forced to own, till he can bring at leaſt one good Inſtance to the contrary; which he has not yet done. This is enough to ſhew in what ſenſe theſe Primitive Martyrs and Confeſſors underſtood the Doctrine of the Scriptures, as to the point of Obedience; and that they could not doubt but their Subjection was due to Governors in general, and more particularly to ſuch wicked and tyrannical Governors, as our Saviour and his Apoſtles lived and died under, and who were *the Powers in being* at that time. To this purpoſe not only *Epiphanius* teaches, That (*a*) *the Powers of the World are ordained of God, and have received the Power of the Sword for vengeance*; and S. *Ambroſe* (*b*) That *this is ſpoken againſt ſuch as think themſelves too powerful to be brought to legal Puniſhment; therefore he ſhews them that it is what God's Law requires, and they muſt not hope to avoid his Judgment, howſoever they may poſſibly eſcape for a while*; and *Irenæus* ſpeaking of wicked and tyrannical Kings,

 ſays,

(*a*) Hæreſ. XL. c. 4. (*b*) In loc.

ſays, (*a*) *They ſhall periſh by the juſt Judgment of God*, without the leaſt intimation of their being any way accountable to their Subjects; but *Origen* (*b*) plainly owns wicked and perſecuting Powers to be from God, and refers them for their Puniſhment to God's juſt Judgment, as *Irenæus* had done before. And though in treating on the next Verſe he ſays, the Apoſtle does not ſpeak of ſuch Powers as perſecute the Faith, I cannot underſtand him to mean more than that an active Obedience is not to be given to ſuch, becauſe otherwiſe I cannot ſee the force of the reaſon given of this Aſſertion, *That God is to be obeyed rather than Man.* And if Mr. *H.* can put any other Conſtruction upon the Words, and give a good Reaſon for it, I ſhall be willing to be inſtructed by him. *Theodoret* (*c*) takes bad Kings to be ſent by God, as a Puniſhment to a wicked People. And S. *Chryſoſtom* (*d*) declares thoſe that are not ſubject, *To reſiſt God, and prepare for themſelves ſore Evils, both from God and Man.* Theſe and others of the Fathers do not indeed ſcholaſtically define the Extent of this Duty; it having not been then diſputed, they do not each one nicely ſtate the limits of it. But yet amongſt them they teach that theſe earthly Powers are ordained of God, even wicked Perſecuting Powers are ſent as a Puniſhment to a wicked People, and ſuch as are not ſubject to them, muſt expect to be puniſhed for it both by God and Man. I proceed next to ſhew,

II. What indiſpenſable Obligation they thought themſelves under, and how neceſſarily it was required of them, to behave themſelves accordingly. And this is eaſily to be collected from their conſtant Practice, and the wonderful Readineſs, wherewith they all along ſubmitted to the Hardſhips that were put upon them, by their cruel and perſecuting Emperors; ſuch as Fleſh and Blood had the utmoſt averſion to, and muſt inevitably have recoiled from, and ſought by all means poſſible to avoid, if they had not been under the influence of a higher

(*a*) Adv. Hær. *l.* 5. *c.* 24. (*b*) In loc. (*c*) In loc. (*d*) In loc.

higher Principle, and had greater and better Hopes and Expectations to support them under all those Conflicts. They had their Senses about them, as well as others; and Poverty, Pain, and Death must doubtless have made the same Impressions upon them, as upon their Neighbours round about them, and put them upon the same Methods that others were so prone to, for their own Preservation, had it not been that they had more regard for the Soul than for the Body, for another Eternal State than for this short, transitory, uncertain Life, and looked upon it as matter of infinitely greater Concernment to them, to *escape the Damnation of Hell*, than to deliver themselves from the Fury of the most insatiably blood-thirsty Tyrant. And knowing moreover that *Damnation* was expressly threaten'd to such as *Resist the Higher Powers*, they thought any Attempts of that nature to be as much as their Souls were worth, and durst therefore upon no account engage in them. They considered what Religion they were of, and whose Disciples they professed themselves to be; and this naturally led them to the imitation of that Meek, and Holy Example he had set them, and the conscientious observance of all the Laws he had prescribed them, and this of Submission to Authority amongst the rest. They could not think themselves at liberty to *break* any the least of his Commands; especially not one that had *Damnation* so particularly annext to the violation of it. They were truly sensible of the unquestionably supreme Authority of the Imposer, together with the solemn Covenant and Stipulation they had entered into with him at their Baptism, which no worldly Considerations whatever could cancel, and for the Observance whereof they must certainly be called to account at the last Day.

And how singularly careful they were, to fulfil what they had thus undertaken, and what a dreadful Notion they had of the Breach of it, may justly be inferred from the behaviour of *Julian*'s Soldiers in another case. Of whom *Gregory Nazianzen* gives this remarkable account; That when they had not wilfully departed from their

Duty, but been purely tricked into the tranſgreſſion of it, without the leaſt apprehenſion of what they were doing, they were no ſooner made ſenſible of their Sin, but they were almoſt beſides themſelves at the diſcovery. The caſe in ſhort was this. (*a*) The Emperor, on a certain day, appointed for the diſtribution of his Bounty to his Soldiers, had commanded them all to be preſent, to accept of the ſeveral Kindneſſes he deſigned them, according to their Merits. And *being royally adorned, and majeſtically ſeated upon his Throne, with heaps of Gold, and Frankincenſe, and a Fire before him*, each one was directed as he came, to throw a little Frankincenſe into the Fire, as a Ceremony then expected from them, and which was uſual upon ſuch occaſions. *This moſt of them ignorantly complied with, not imagining any Guilt contracted by it, or* (*b*) *that it tended to their deſtruction.* Till at length being told they had herein denied Chriſt, and worſhiped Idols, they were hereupon immediately ſtruck with Terror, and became like Men half dead; running forth, as if they were diſtracted, and publickly crying out, and bemoaning themſelves, and declaring before God and Men, that they were (*c*) *unfeigned Chriſtians.* And haſtening to the Emperor, they threw down the Money, with ſad complaints of the horrid Abuſe he had put upon them, ſupplicating him to put them to death, as they had deſerved, and to cut off their *Hands* with which they had received his Gold, and their *Feet* that had brought them to partake of it. Such was their Zeal, for maintaining their Fidelity to their *only Lord and Saviour*, above all the Earthly Advantages they could poſſibly propound to themſelves.

And we may depend upon it, that this was not a particular Caſe, nor theſe Men only thus nearly concerned for their Religion, but they and others had the ſame regard for other parts of their Duty, and did accordingly in all reſpects *exerciſe themſelves to have Conſciences*

(*a*) Στηλιτ. α. p. 46, 47, 48.
(*b*) Οὐδὲ πῶς ἑαυτῶν σφαγὼ εἰδότες οἱ πλείους.
(*c*) χριστιανοὶ, χριστιανοὶ τὰς ψυχάς.

sciences void of Offence, both towards God, and towards Man, and would not ſtick to part with all they enjoyed here, and to lay down their dearеſt Lives for their Saviour's ſake, whenſoever they conceived it to be for his Glory. To ſerve God aright, whatever it coſt them, was the main ſtudy of their Lives. It was their Meat and Drink, (*a*) as it had been their bleſſed Lord's, *to do the Will of their Heavenly Father*, without attending to the preſent Evils they might probably, and perhaps certainly bring upon themſelves by it. And multitudes of them never ſeemed better pleaſed, than when they were called to part with all they had, and to ſuffer and dye for the ſake of a good Conſcience.

And therefore being, as I have obſerved, fully convinced of the Doctrines of Chriſtianity in point of Obedience to Authority, they could not fail to teſtify the Obligation they were under from them at all times, and even under the moſt prevalent Temptations they met with to the contrary. That they did thus behave themſelves, I have ſhewn I hope beyond contradiction. And no other reaſon of their doing it can be aſſigned, but that Senſe of Duty they had upon their Souls, which would not allow them to do otherwiſe. They were mindful of the Injunctions that had been given them, their own Vows and Promiſes to obſerve them, the Hope that was ſet before them, and the dreadful Threatnings of *Wrath and fiery Indignation to devour* the Refractary and Diſobedient, and could not find in their Hearts to break through all theſe, to avoid ſome outward temporal Inconvenience, or Danger. And now I ſhall not need to be long in ſhewing,

III. How loudly the Pattern they have ſet us, calls for an undaunted imitation of it. For if we aim at the ſame bleſſed State whither they are gone before, and whereto they were ſo earneſtly deſirous to be advanced, though in a Chariot of Fire, or through a Sea of Blood, we muſt be content to follow them the ſame way, if it ſhall pleaſe God in his good Providence to call us to it.

(*a*) *S.* John 4. 34.

We are not bound to court Sufferings from whatever hand, but may safely use all fair and honest ways for escaping them; *when persecuted in one City, may flee into another*, (*a*) as our Saviour directs, and (*b*) as the primitive Christians many times did, may privately withdraw and conceal ourselves, may sue for favour and pity, and try by a patient submission to win upon, and pacify our Persecutors, but must not go out of God's way to save ourselves, nor seek to prevent their utmost Fury, by the use of forbidden Arms, or any other method not agreeable to his Word and Will. We have not another Gospel, from what the Primitive Professors of our Faith had, nor another Reward offered us, and to be obtained upon other Terms. Wherefore if we would shew ourselves true Disciples of the same Lord with them, and would hope for the same inestimable Prize they have so happily obtained, we must inevitably be prepared to tread the same Steps, and run the same Race with them; and must no more be terrified out of our Integrity, by whatsoever appearance of Danger, than they were.

And indeed who can reflect upon those Words of our blessed Saviour, (*c*) *Whosoever shall deny me before men*, which every one interpretatively does, that chooses Sin, the Sin of Resistance as well as any other, before Suffering, *him will I deny before my Father which is in Heaven*, who, I say, can reflect upon these Words of our Saviour, and not be willing to dye with him, if occasion for it should offer itself, as these heavenly-minded Christians did? Who can observe S. *Polycarp* professing (*d*) an immovable Dependence upon God, and repelling the *Proconsul*'s motion, to save his Life by Swearing, and Reviling Christ, with this Reply; (*e*) *These eighty and six years I have served him, and he never did me any hurt; how shall I blaspheme my King and my Saviour?* and as it is added

(*a*) *S.* Mat. 10. 23. (*b*) *B.* Athanas. Apol. de fugâ suâ.
(*c*) *S.* Matt. 10. 33. (*d*) Eccl. Smyrn. *Epist. c.* 9.
(*e*) Ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτη ἔχω δουλεύων αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐδέν με ἠδίκησεν· καὶ πῶς δύναμαι βλασφημῆσαι τὸν βασιλέα μου, τὸν σώσαντά με; ibid.

added in the *Latin* Translation, *the Persecutor of the Wicked, and the Avenger of the Righteous*; or S. *Ignatius* entreating his Friends not to use any endeavours for putting off his death, out of an unseasonable and mistaken kindness to him, but that they would (*a*) *let the Beasts devour him, that so he might attain to the Enjoyment of God*, proclaiming himself to be *God's Grain, and that he wanted to be ground by the Beasts Teeth to make him the pure Bread of Christ*, and desiring they would *set on the Beasts to bury him in their Bowels*; or (*b*) *Felix* of *Tubyza* assuring the Proconsul *Anulinus* of his being *a Christian, and a Bishop, and that he would upon no terms deliver up his Bible*, and again affirming the same thing to the Prefect at *Nola*; or *Justin Martyr* glorying in behalf of the Christians in general, (*c*) *That they could undergo the utmost Severities rather than offer Sacrifice, and could rejoice in Dying upon so good an account, in a firm Expectation of an abundant Reward for it?* Who, can observe these, and innumerable other like Expressions of an unfeigned Duty to our Lord, a hearty Zeal for his Glory, and an earnest Desire of a full Enjoyment of him, and not have their Minds raised above the things of this World, and their Wills fixed, and all the Faculties of their Souls engaged, neither to decline any Sufferings upon their Lord's account, nor undutifully resist their Superiours, when the unhappy Instruments of them?

These glorious Saints were noble Patterns of true Christian Piety and Patience. And nothing can better become us, than to shew forth the same Meekness and Constancy with them, and be ready upon all occasions, to suffer with as much undaunted Courage, and yet with as little Opposition as they did. Nor can the Refusal of this be justified, unless it could have been proved, that they sinned in suffering themselves to be so inhumanly Butchered, and did not rather unite their Forces, and struggle for the Preservation of their Lives, and the Lives

(*a*) Epist. ad Rom. *c.* 4.
(*b*) Pass. S. Felicis. ep. Tubyz. edit. Oxon. 1680.
(*c*) Tryph. *p.* 265, 323, 337, 349, 360.

Lives and Welfare of their Posterity. Which is a Charge I hope Mr. *H.* will not pretend to draw up againſt them, and which I am ſure neither he, nor any one elſe would ever be able to make good. I cannot think he will venture to aſſign theſe excellent Worthies as Enemies to the Good of Human Society, to their Religion, themſelves, and all that ſhould come after them; only becauſe their Minds, their Thoughts and Deſires were ſet above all things, upon ſerving, and pleaſing, and approving themſelves to God here, and enjoying him eternally hereafter, in that unſpeakable Bliſs and Felicity, which he has promis'd to all that duly labour after it. How much more reaſonable would it be for him, and all of us, to conſider, that *having here no abiding City*, we are infinitely concerned to ſeek after another that is better and more laſting, and to receive all the ill Uſage we meet with in our Paſſage towards it, with the ſame calmneſs and ſerenity of Mind, and the ſame Submiſſion and Non-reſiſtance which was ſo remarkable in them, and for which their Memory has been ſo deſervedly honoured ever ſince?

Examples are a powerful Motive to Imitation, a ſhorter and readier way of teaching our Duty, and inviting to it, as (*a*) *Seneca* has noted long ago; and many times prove of greater and more expeditious Influence than Precepts, as (*b*) a great Man has ſhewn ſince. And ſuch illuſtrious Examples as theſe, if duly attended to, will naturally be ſpurring on to ſome like noble Atchievement. *Plutarch* has left it upon record concerning the valiant *Themiſtocles*, (*c*) that he could not ſleep for thinking of *Miltiades*'s mighty Victory over the *Perſians*; and of *Theſeus*, that (*d*) *Hercules*'s famous Exploits would neither ſuffer him to be at eaſe Night nor Day, becauſe himſelf had done nothing like them. Such an Emulation had theſe unuſual Examples raiſed in their generous Minds. And is it not incomparably more rational for all true Chriſtians, to

(*a*) *Longum eſt iter per præcepta, breve & efficax per exempla.* Epiſt. 6. (*b*) Dr. *Barrow*, vol. 3. Serm. 2. p. 17.
(*c*) *In vita* Theſei. (*d*) *Ibid.*

to have their Affections enflamed at the remembrance of these Heroick Champions for the Faith, awakening our drowsy Souls, stimulating our sluggishness, and pressing to a like Submission under all our Trials? A Consideration, not only of what they suffered, but also of their manner of Suffering it without Resistance, is of admirable Force, for recommending to all serious Christians an unwearied Imitation of such their Passive, and truly Christian Deportment.

But not only their Example is to be attended to in this Case, but it is of great use to reflect, that Non-resistance was the general Doctrin of all Christians, through all the best Ages of the Church. When Religion was in its Prime, and People were most strictly observant of their Duty in all respects, then this Doctrin was universally received, and none that bare the Name of Christians pretended to think of an Exemption from it. And that the contrary has met with such Countenance and Encouragement since, is owing to the lamentable Degeneracy of Manners, and that insatiable Love of the World, which as the Apostle informs us, (*a*) *is Enmity with GOD*, and which has introduced too great plenty of other shameful Immoralities together with it. So long as Men were duly mindful of their Blessed Lord, and his Example and Commands, they could readily plead their own Loyalty, to their Persecutors, and challenge them to find out any amongst the Followers of Christ, that had ever had a hand in any Treason or Rebellion. Which shews beyond doubt, in what Sence the several Passages in Scripture, so often cited in favour of Obedience to Authority, were then understood; and by consequence, how they ought to be understood now, by all that profess to own the same Lord they did, and be guided by the same Principles they were guided by. For it is to be remembered, that these were not only Holy and Good Men, and whose great Aim was GOD'S Glory, and their own Salvation; and who were therefore least of any under the Power of sensual and secular Interests and De-

(*a*) *S. Ja. 4. 4.*

Deſigns; and ſo were like to be the faireſt and moſt impartial Interpreters of Scripture; but that they unanimouſly agreed againſt *Reſiſtance of the Higher Powers*; no one Inſtance being left us all this time, of any Chriſtian that dared to appear in defence of it. And if ſuch an univerſal Conſent of ſuch Men, in ſuch Times, and for ſo long together, be not ſufficient to aſſert the true Interpretation even of leſs clear Texts of Scripture, than theſe whereupon the Doctrin of Non-reſiſtance is founded, and eſpecially of ſuch as are thus plain, it will be to no purpoſe to think of ever underſtanding *What the Will of the Lord is*, in relation to this or any other Chriſtian Duty. And I muſt confeſs I cannot ſee, why an Argument drawn from the Doctrins and Practices of theſe firſt Ages, is not to all Intents and Purpoſes as good and valid againſt Mr. *H.* or any other Patrons of Reſiſtance, as it is againſt either Papiſts or Diſſenters in other Caſes.

It is true, had we received a New Goſpel, relaxing the Obligation of the former; and allowing to take quite contrary Meaſures to what that preſcribes, this would be no Argument againſt any of them. But whilſt the contrary holds good, whilſt we have the ſame Lord to obey, and the ſame Laws to be governed by, have had no New Revelation to teach us a different ſort of Doctrin, but ſtill profeſs to adhere to the Old, and to be under the ſame Rule with the Primitive Church; that which they received from our Saviour and his Apoſtles, and we ſucceſſively from them; there remains no Excuſe for thoſe that both reſolve and teach to act in contradiction to it. They muſt either condemn theſe former Profeſſors of the Faith, for having avowed and practiſed this Doctrin, or themſelves, for being ſo averſe to it.

The ſum is, that ſince not only the Scriptures, taken in their moſt natural and genuine Sence, plainly teach the Doctrin of Paſſive Obedience and Non-reſiſtance, even to tyrannical and wicked Princes, Enemies to GOD and true Religion; but the Univerſal Church of Chriſt practiſed accordingly for ſeveral Ages, there is nothing to excuſe ſuch in theſe latter Days,

Days, as pretend to *Walk by the same Rule* with them, the revealed Word of GOD contained in those Sacred Volumes, there is nothing I say to excuse such from the like submissive, meek and patient manner of Deportment. And if any instead of this, shall take upon them *to Resist the Higher Powers*, they have all the Reason in the World to expect that heavy *Damnation*, which the Apostle has so peremptorily denounced against those that do so.

And now what has Mr. *H.* to say to this? Truly very little to any purpose. He is desirous to shift off this Argument as well as he can, and employs all his force to this end; but so as can never give Satisfaction to an impartial and inquisitive Reader, especially if he has any sort of insight into the History of the Times I have been treating of. He would fain persuade the World, that this Argument is of small weight, and ought to have very little regard paid to it. He is willing to assent to the consentient Testimony of these Fathers, as he would to the Authority of an unblemished Historian; but he has no Deference for their Judgment, nor will yield them to have in any respect *known the Will of our* Lord *and his* Apostles, *better than* We *at this distance*. He also insinuates, as if *their Practice were not truly parallel to that* Passive Obedience *against which he had argued*; and again, that *the Principle on which this* Practice was *built, is not sufficient to prove the Expedience and Duty of such Passive Obedience*. Wherefore this Defence of his against so Powerful a Cloud of Witnesses, I come next to consider, and to prove the Weakness and Invalidity of it. But this will be the matter of the next Section.

SECT. IV.

What Mr. H. *has offered in Answer to this Argument, from the Doctrin and Practice of the Primitive Christians.*

THis is all that remains of the Second Chapter, and tho' it will require a somewhat larger Discussion than I expected, his Defence being branch'd out into many Particulars,

ticulars, yet I see nothing in all he offers but what is capable of an easy and fair Solution: As will soon appear upon an impartial Enquiry into his several Observations, and his Inferences from them, whereby to maintain his *Hypothesis:* Which I know not how solidly he imagines to be supported by them, but am well satisfied, they will all leave it in a tottering condition, upon a brief Survey of them. Thus therefore he begins.

I. (a) *This Argument is not at all conclusive; nor allowed to be so by the* Protestant Writers, *and greatest Advocates for the* Church *of* England *in many other cases.* This is easily said. But he is not pleased to tell us who are these *Protestant Writers*, and *Advocates for the* Church *of* England; and till he does I am not at all concerned about them, nor any way bound to admit that there are any such.

II. He allows (*b*) *the universal Testimony of the* First Christians *as to* Matter *of* Fact, *must be received.* A singular Favour, and a very gracious Condescention! He is so kind, he will not give the Lye to the consentient Testimony of all the best and purest Christians in a Matter of Fact recorded by them, but will allow them to be at least as credible as common Heathen Historians, who must be believed too, where they seem to speak Truth. This is notably done. But then it follows, (*c*) that *their Judgment in any difficult Point, or any part of their Practice depending upon that Judgment, ought not to be any farther regarded, than as it is founded on the* Reason *of the thing itself, or the Declaration of* Christ *and his* Apostles. But the best of it is, others, Men of great Probity and Knowledge, have had, have, and will have a Regard to the Universal Practice of these admirable Patterns of Virtue and true Holiness, and to the Doctrines delivered by them, how highly soever Mr. *H.* and his Followers may despise them. He may slight them, if he pleases, as Foolish, and Inconsiderate, and Betrayers of the Liberties and Safety of Mankind; but he must not expect it will be thought Wisdom in him to

(a) *Measures of Submission*, p.133. (*b*) Ibid. (*c*) P.134.

to do so. *Vincentius Lirinensis*'s (*a*) Rule will still prevail, after all Mr. *H.*'s Attempts to the contrary, *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*; that what has been held by all Christians, in all Places, and at all Times, and especially in the first and purest Ages of the Church, must be held sound Christianity. So long therefore as we can prove our Doctrine, as I hope I have fully done, to be agreeable to the holy Scriptures, as interpreted by the general Consent of the Ancients in all Times and Places, we may well depend upon it, as having a Substantial, Solid and Immoveable Foundation. And it is very suspicious that any Writer is sensible of the badness of his Cause, when he is tempted to throw aside such a Succession of the Plousest, and Best, and most Unexceptionable Witnesses the World had ever known, for not being of his Side. Oh! but Mr *H.* is willing to hearken to them, so far as their *Judgment* or *Practice* is built upon *the Reason of the Thing itself*, or on *the Declarations of Christ and his Apostles*. Which I take to mean that he will admit them to be worthy of some Regard, whilst they are of the same Opinion with himself, but he will not yield them to have understood their Duty in this respect any whit better than he does, or to have adhered more faithfully to it. And all he has to say for it is, that *if a middle way can be found out between this and making them Infallible, he will promise to embrace it.* Well then, for once I will try to find out that *Middle Way*, in hope he will honestly make good his Promise of closing in with it. And it is this: That he look upon the Church in its First and Purest Ages, as most worthy of our serious Imitation, in this as well as other respects, and believe its Members, as they had better Advantages for understanding aright the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apostles, than we who live at so great a distance from them, being better acquainted with some particular Phrases then in use, some Customs familiar to them, and some traditionary Accounts, which may since have been either quite lost, or else so grossly cor-

(*a*) Commonit. *c.* 3.

corrupted, as to ſtand us in no ſtead; let him thus look upon the Church in theſe Ages, as better qualified for a right Underſtanding of Scripture, than we at this diſtance, and their univerſal Conſent, as the beſt Commentary upon it; and moreover, to have been much more intent upon putting in Practice what was thus taught them, than the Generality of thoſe that call themſelves Chriſtians are now, as they certainly were, and I promiſe myſelf he will not deny it; let him but take this courſe, and I am apt to think he will ſee his way, *that Middle Way*, plain before him. At leaſt he ought to admit, that a Doctrine in which they ſo univerſally agreed, and which they were ſo willing to reduce into Practice, when they were ſure to pay dear for it, could not be ſo nice and *difficult a Point*, as he would have it apprehended to be. Becauſe it is not eaſily imaginable, that they would have ſo unanimouſly concurred in it, and ſo generally have ventured their Honours, their Employments, their Eſtates, their Lives, and all that was dear to them here for it.

I have always thought a ſingular Reverence due, to the univerſal Conſent of ſeveral Ages of ſuch devout and holy Souls; and that tho' they were not beyond all Poſſibility of Error, yet their Exemplary Piety and Integrity, their Contempt of the World, and Heavenly-mindedneſs, their nearer Acquaintance with the Uſages of the Times wherein the Scriptures were written, and the Language they were written in, the Traditions that they had received from the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors, and Diſciples, and the greater Meaſures of the Holy Ghoſt they may juſtly be preſumed to have had vouchſafed them, for enlightening their Underſtanding, as well as they had for (*a*) Prophecies and (*b*) Miracles, might deſervedly have given them a Prehemi-

(a) Παρὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ μέχει νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐστί. Juſt. Mart. c. Tryph. p. 308. Πλὴν ἡ νῦν ἔτι ἰσχὺς ἔστι τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Orig. c. Celſ. l. 7. p. 337.

(b) Οὐκ ἔστιν ἀειδμὸν εἰπεῖν τῶ χαρισμάτων, ὧν χρὴ παντὸς τὸ

heminence, above such as fall short of them in all these respects. And till Mr. *H.* shall prove this to be an Error, I shall very hardly be perswaded that it is so. But then I must beg leave to tell him, that to convince me, or any one else of this, there will need some stronger Argument, than his bare Assertion, that he *is not the first who has said* the contrary. I am sure it must be a great Disadvantage to any Cause, if it once appear to be no otherwise defensible, than by rejecting all the first Ages of Christianity from the Apostle's time, and downwards for several Generations. Such a Cloud of inconteſtable Witnesses is not to be shaken off; it being impossible to conceive, that they should from the beginning have all thus unanimously agreed in a Principle that had no just Foundation, and was then so detrimental to their temporal Interest, and so directly opposite to the common Inclinations of Flesh and Blood. Such an irresistible Authority would necessarily have called for our Attention to it, though we had not so well understood the Grounds they went upon. But when we have farther all that Mr. *H.* requires as sufficiently satisfactory, both *the Reason of the Thing*, this Doctrine of Non-resistance being most exactly consonant to the Meek and Peaceable, the Passive and Obedient Temper of the Gospel, and *its being founded on the Declarations of our Lord and his Apostles*, if this be not a threefold Cord that is not to be broken, there can be no such thing. And since this is *a middle way* which makes them of great Authority, but yet not *Infallible*, I leave it with Mr. *H.* hoping he will not *forget his Promise to embrace it*.

But Mr. *H.* proceeds; and excepts to some of the Passages alledged against him, as not answering the End they are alledged for, which therefore come now to be considered.

τὸ κόσμω ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ θεοῦ λαβοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ ποντίου πιλάτου, ἐκάστης ἡμέρας εἰς εὐεργασίαν τῇ πρὸς θεὸν ἐπιτελεῖ. Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 2. c. 57. Fiunt ergo etiam nunc multa miracula: eodem Deo faciente, per quos vult, & quomodo vult, qui & illa quæ legimus fecit. S. Augustin. de civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 8.

1. (*a*) *Some*, he says, *are such as only declare in general, that Subjection is due to those in Authority, without any expreſs limitation; and others add, in all cases in which they are not under higher Obligations to Almighty God; and this does not contradict any thing he has said.* Now it is true, he has never said *in general, that Subjection is* not *due to those in Authority.* And yet I can by no means see how his Doctrine, and that of these Christian Apologists and other Writers can consist together; because they seem apparently to have a different meaning, even in these same Words to which they both subscribe. These taught Obedience and Subjection to wicked and tyrannical Princes, the Invaders of their Rights, and professed Enemies to their Religion, and to themselves upon that account; and this without any Restraint or Reservation, or in his own Words, *without any expreſs Limitation.* And therefore when in general Terms they only recommend *Subjection to those in Authority*, this in all reasonable Construction must be understood, to imply all that they at other times declare themselves to mean by being subject. On the other hand, Mr. *H.* allows of Subjection, but in a very different degree from theirs, that is to say, so far only as he apprehends his Prince to give a due Attendance to the *End of his Institution*; adding withal, that when *he deflects from that*, it is the Subject's Duty to stand up for himself; and (*b*) *a Passive Non-resistance in this case would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary.* So that when he admits Subjection to be a Duty, this can be thought to intend no more, than that it is a Duty till it shall be judged a proper season for Resistance. But it will be very absurd to fix this Interpretation upon the looser Expressions of such, as both by their Words and Actions are well known to have condemned all Resistance, upon whatever account, and without any manner of Restriction. Yet this is all the Agreement that is betwixt Mr. *H.* and Them, when they both *declare in general Forms of Speech, that Subjection*

is

(*a*) P. 135. (*b*) P. 8.

is due to those in Authority. So that this is a mere Sophism and Equivocation; and I dare answer for Mr. *H.* that if he retain his old Principles, he will never declare *Subjection to be due to those in Authority*, in the sense that the Primitive Christians did.

Others, he says, *add, in all cases, in which they are not under higher Obligations to Almighty God.* In which also he pretends to agree with them. But if we enquire a little, we shall soon discover another Amphibology, and that he is no nearer agreeing with them in the true Sense of these Words, wherein they understood them, than he was in the former. For their meaning by a *higher Obligation to Almighty God*, was not as his is, an Obligation to defend the temporal Rights and Safety of the Community against their Violence, but an Obligation not to obey any Command of theirs that was sinful, either in its own Nature, or as forbidden by God. They had a stricter Tye to study the Welfare of their Souls, than to promote their secular Safety or Advantage, by any undue Compliances with the unlawful Commands of their Superiours. And here they made a stand, and would endure whatever was laid upon them, rather than sin against God to please their Earthly Sovereign; which is the only Case that they except to. And will Mr. *H.* advise to all other Submission but this? Will he admit that I may prefer the Salvation of my Soul before the Ease and Safety of the Body, or even of the Community whereto I appertain; and that so I do but forbear transgressing God's Commands, I may pay all other Subjection to my lawful Governors, though both the Society and myself were to suffer by it? If he will, our Controversy is brought to a fair issue. But if he will not, I must be forced to tell him, that it is not very fair to affirm *that this does not contradict any thing he has said*; inasmuch as, if rightly understood, it manifestly contradicts the main Design of his Book, and all that he has said in it in favour of Resistance.

2. (*a*) *Some are such as only declare Princes to be second*

(*a*) P. 135.

to God, leſs than God only, and the like. All which he can heartily ſubſcribe to. But if he do, I much doubt he will ſubſcribe againſt his own Doctrine. For if the Prince be *next to God*, and ſo have none above him but God alone, he will find it a difficult matter to maintain, that thoſe who are under him are any way impowered to call him to account for his Miſgovernment. Nor is the Caſe he puts here at all parallel. Which is, that *this can no more prove them to be in all caſes* irreſiſtible, *than it can prove it unlawful to reſiſt any Perſon in his violent Attempts upon the Lives, or Fortunes of others, to ſay that he is* ſecond *to the* King, *and diſtinguiſhed by his Poſt from the reſt of the Nation.* For the next Perſon to the King is but a Subject, and the Laws are open, and Redreſs to be had ordinarily in that way, againſt the Violence he offers to any of his Fellow-Subjects; and there is the King's Authority for it. But where thoſe Laws are to be found, that ſhould puniſh King's in like manner, Mr. *H.* has not yet ſhewn, nor ever can ſhew, as he very well knows, and for this ſubſtantial Reaſon, Becauſe there are none ſuch in being, either in Scripture, or Statute, or Common Law. So that it is plain here is no parity in the Caſes put by him.

Beſides, May not Princes be exempt from Reſiſtance, though their Seconds were not? This muſt neceſſarily be granted, unleſs Mr. *H.* will ſay, that becauſe he holds that Kings, who are Seconds to God, may be reſiſted, therefore God to whom they are Seconds, may be reſiſted too.

3. (*a*) *Some Paſſages alledged declare that God gave the Empire to Wicked Princes, as well as to the Good; and the like.* And this Mr. *H.* will have to mean no more than a bare permiſſive Providence. So that according to him the Prince has no better Right to his Power, than the Highwayman has to every Purſe he takes; inaſmuch as he could not take it without God's Permiſſion. And there is not a Deiſt or *Epicurean* in the Nation, but how great an Enemy ſoever to the Divine Providence, will never-

(*a*) Ibid.

nevertheleſs own as much as this comes to. Hereupon alſo another Abſurdity would follow; namely, That ſo it would be impoſſible to explain how *the Powers that be, are ordained of God*; as I have (*a*) formerly obſerv'd.

But it is a ſad Concluſion, ſays Mr. *H. to infer from hence, that he bore an active part in the bringing all the* Roman *Emperors into the Poſſeſſion of their Power.* Be it as ſad as Mr. *H.* will have it, yet ſince it is what was taught not only by other Chriſtians, but by S. *Paul* in the Words now recited, it is ſuch as Mr. *H.* and all that call themſelves Chriſtians ought undoubtedly to acquieſce in. For which reaſon I would beg of Mr. *H.* to take heed how he condemns it, becauſe in ſo doing he certainly condemns the holy Scriptures that teach it in the firſt place, as well as the Fathers after them.

It follows, *And as wretched a Concluſion, to infer from ſuch Expreſſions, that it is his Will they ſhould be irreſiſtible in their whole Exerciſe of this Power.* I am ſorry Mr. *H.* ſhould ſet ſo ill a Character upon a Concluſion that has nothing in it, but what I have fully proved to be plainly taught in Scripture. But it is eaſy to ſee how far ſome Mens Zeal for a Cauſe will carry them.

Again ſays Mr. *H. The very Power of doing the greateſt Injuries to his Neighbours is of God, the Maker and Governor of all things.* But the Queſtion is only, whether it be ſo of God as the Prince's Power and Authority is. Wherefore let me ask; Has God any where declared, that there is no injurious Perſon but of him, and that he is his Ordinance? Is *every Soul* commanded *to be ſubject* to the injurious Perſon? And is *Damnation* threatened to all that Reſiſt him? If not, I am apt to think Mr. *H.* will find himſelf quite beſides his Text.

Laſtly, Mr. *H.* ſubjoins, *The Empire and Power of Foreign Princes are of God, nay their very Invaſions upon their neighbouring Nations could not be without his Permiſſion*;

(*a*) *Part* I. *p.* 136, 137.

but doth he therefore require those neighbouring Nations passively to submit, and to use no Arms of Resistance? And the same Answer will serve for this. For though the Power of foreign Princes over their proper Subjects is from God, they have no Power given them by him over such as they have no relation to. And though *their Invasions upon their neighbouring Nations could not be without his Permission*, Mr. *H* acknowledges *he has no where required those neighbouring Nations passively to submit, and to use no Arms of Resistance.* And this is a very good reason, why they are under no Obligation to such a Submission and Non-resistance. But it will by no means follow from hence that Subjects are not obliged to submit to, and may with a good Conscience resist their own Lawful Superiours, the Resisting of whom is expressly declared to be *Resisting God's Ordinance*, and the Punishment of it to be *Damnation.*

4. *If there be any Passages in the Fathers, which in general Expressions cloath Princes with a Divine Authority, it cannot be supposed from hence, that it was their Design to signify by such Expressions, that Princes were accompanied, in every single Instance of their Government, with a Divine Authority.* This Mr. *H.* (*a*) asserts, and offers these two Reasons for it. 1. *Because this would give to Almighty God an active part in their Wickedness.* 2. *Because this would extend so far as to lay an Obligation upon themselves, to pay an active Obedience to all their Commands, which they often denied to be due to them, and frequently refused to pay.* Both which Reasons (*b*) I have formerly answered; and have observed in relation to the former of them, that Almighty God is no way chargable with the Abuse of a Power given by him in order to a better End. Which Mr. *H.* must own to be true, unless he will lay upon God the load of all the Sins that ever were committed in the World, because committed by a Power derived from him, though designed for the Serving him, and keeping his Commandments. And in relation to the

(*a*) *P.* 136.
(*b*) *Part* I. *p.* 36, 37, & 44, 45, & 131, 132, 139, 140.

the other I have noted again and again, that God has set Bounds to our Active Obedience, by requiring *to obey himself rather than Man*, but has no where limited our Passive Submission, or said, *thus far shall ye suffer and no farther.*

5. *There are other Passages alledged, which only relate it as a matter of Fact, in order to obtain the Favour of their Princes, that the Christians were never found to be in any Plots, or any Seditions raised against them, which is only a Proof, that in their Circumstances, they knew their Interest so well as not to concern themselves in the State-Parties then in being, and not to render themselves odious, and suspected to the Emperor then in Possession. But it is impossible to prove from hence, that it was their Opinion, that a People ought passively to submit themselves, to be ruined at the Will of their Prince.* Whereto I return Answer in these following Particulars.

1. I grant that the Christians did urge this for themselves, to obtain the Favour of their Princes, who had great Cause, if they would have considered it, to be very fond of, and shew all the Encouragement that might be to such faithful loyal Subjects, who stuck to them against all Opposers, and quietly and patiently submitted to them, under all the hard Trials they met with from them; and whom neither hope of Deliverance on the one hand could invite, nor fear of Suffering on the other could terrify, out of their Duty to them. This was a Plea that they might reasonably expect, should recommend them to the Mercy and Kindness of their Princes, as being the faithfullest and best of all their Subjects. And no wonder therefore if they made use of it, as they had occasion.

2. But then I deny that Policy, and not Duty, was the cause of this Submission, as Mr. *H.* would insinuate. They knew very well the Doctrine of the Gospel in this respect, and how strictly they were bound to behave themselves according to it, and so became obedient out of a sense of Duty to God, and a serious Regard to another Life, and frequently appeal to the Principles of their Religion for their Vindication, declaring it a ne-

ceſſary part thereof, (*a*) to Honour, and Obey, and be Subject to the King *for the Lord's ſake*, and out of Obedience to his Commands. And Mr. *H.* if he will reflect upon it, may eaſily be convinced how unkindly he deals by them, in reſolving all thoſe Sufferings, for which their Memory has been ſo worthily celebrated, and they have been had in ſuch Honour and Veneration ever ſince, into mere Policy and Reaſon of State. Let a Man be ever ſo Serious and Religious, and ever ſo deſirous to ſerve God to the utmoſt of his Power, his beſt Actions may however be ſhamefully tarniſhed at this rate. He may be ſuppoſed Sober only for his Health's ſake or to ſave his Money; Honeſt only to preſerve his Credit, Devout out of Vainglory and to be ſeen of Men; or whatever Virtues ſhine brighteſt in him may be ſaid however to proceed, not from a true Principle of Religion in his Soul, but from ſome ſecular and unworthy Deſign. But does Mr. *H.* count this fair dealing? Or would he be willing to be uſed thus himſelf? If not, he would do well to make ſome Reparation to theſe truly Chriſtian Worthies, on whom he has caſt ſuch an undeſerved Reflection. Who were certainly of a very different Temper, and had quite other Aims and Deſigns from what he ſeems to intimate. *Their Converſation was in Heaven*; and their great Care was to lay up to themſelves Treaſures there, little minding what became of all their Worldly Concerns, or even of themſelves in the mean time. They *had reſpect to the Recompence of Reward*, that ineſtimable Crown of Glory, which eaſily enabled them (*b*) to wade even through Seas of Blood to get at it. They

counted

(*a*) Λέγει ὁ νόμος τὸ θεῖον· τίμα τὸν θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα, καὶ μηδενὶ αὐτῶν ἀπειθὴς ἦς. Theoph. Ant. ad Autol. *l.* 1. *p.* 77. Et Apoſtolus *Paulus* hoc ipſum ait; *Omnibus poteſtatibus ſublimioribus ſubjecti eſtote*; *non eſt enim poteſtas niſi à Deo.* Iren. adv. hæreſ. *l.* 5. *c.* 24. Μή ποτε δίκαιον εἶναι διδάσκων τὸ κατ' ἀνθρώπου τὸ μνημα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῶν, καὶ ἀδικῶται καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἦ. Orig. c. Celſ. *l.* 3. *p.* 115.

(*b*) Ἐγὼ μαχαίρας, ἐγὼ θεοῦ· μεταξὺ θηείων, μεταξὺ θεοῦ.

counted (*c*) *not their Lives dear to them, that they might finish their Course with Joy, and attain to the Resurrection of the Just*, and be for ever happy in the Kingdom of Heaven. So little were they afraid of the cruellest Deaths, (*d*) and had such a fondness for this sort of departure out of the World, that they were really under no Temptation to save themselves by Resistance, if they could have been sure to do it. And accordingly encouraged each other (*e*) to proceed resolutely in their Patience and Constancy to the Death, always keeping in

---

θεῦ. B. Ignat. ep. ad Smyrn. Ταύτῃ ἄρα τὰς πύρας, καὶ τὰς βασάνους, καὶ θλίψεις, ἔχ ὡς παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις οἱ ἀνδρεῖοι, ἐλπίδι τῇ πυσαῶς μὴ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα ἀλγεινὰ, αὖθις ἢ τῶν ἡδίονα μεταλαβεῖν, ὑπομένει [ὁ γναπκὸς] ἀλλ' ἡ γνῶσις αὐτῷ πεῖσμα βέβαιον ἐνεγέννησε τ ἦξ μελλόντων ἐλπίδων ἀπολήψεως. Clem. Alex. Strom. *l.* 7. Qui se excruciandos, & excarnificandos pro Evangelio furentibus tradidissent, ne Martyrii honorem merito perderent. *B. Cypr. epist.* 30. Famem vincitis, & sitim spernitis, & squalorem carceris, ac receptaculi pœnalis horrorem roboris vigore calcatis. Pœna illic subigitur, cruciatus obteritur, nec mors metuitur, sed optatur, quæ scilicet immortalitatis præmio vincitur, ut vitæ æternitate qui vicerit coronetur. *Id ep.* 37. Carcer Christicolis gradus coronæ est. *Prudent. Hymn.* 6. Μείζονα πλῆτον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἤγηνται τ τῆ βίᾳ δόξης καὶ τρυφῆς, τὰς ὑπὲρ δσιβείας ὀνειδισμὸς τε καὶ πόνους, καὶ τὰς κεκαινοργημένας ἐν αὐτοῖς πολυτρόπους θανάτους· &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. *l.* 8. *c.* 6.

(*c*) Spernunt tormenta præsentia --- & dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent. *Cæcil. in Min. Fel.* Θανατώμενοι χαίρομεν. πεδόντες ὅτι ἀναστήσει ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆ χριστῆ αὐτῆ, καὶ ἀφθάρτους, καὶ ἀπαθεῖς, καὶ ἀθανάτους ποιήσει. Just. M. c. Tryph.

(*d*) Αὐπίνα τελείωσιν τὸ μαρτύριον καλῆμεν, ἔχ ὅπ τέλος τῆ βίᾳ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔλαβεν, ἀλλ' ὅπ ἄρα τέλειον ἔργον ἀγάπης ἐνεδείξατο. Clem. Alex. Strom. *l.* 4. Θανατῶμεν μᾶλλον αἱρώμεθα, καὶ ὑπομένομεν, πεπεισμένοι ὅτι πάνθ' ὅσα ὑπέχηται ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆ χριστῆ ἀγαθὰ, ἀποδώσει ἡμῖν. Just. Mart. c. Tryph.

(*e*) Bonum agonem subituri estis, in quo Agonothetes Deus vivus est, Xystarches spiritus sanctus, corona æternitatis brabium, angelicæ substantiæ politeia in cœlis, gloria in secula seculorum. *Tertull. ad Martyras.* c. 3.

in mind that *(f)* their Loss of this World and all they enjoyed in it, together with all the Troubles and Sorrows that befel them, were in no wise to be compared with that unconceivable Felicity which they had continually in their Eye, and wherein they were shortly to be instated.

And what an intolerable Affront is it to them, now at length after so many Ages of Fame and Glory, to represent them as a company of mere Pretenders, who gave out that Non-resistance was a known part of their Religion, when in truth they believed nothing of it, and all their Submission was owing to worldly Policy, and a desire to live easily here at present? This is such a Disgrace cast upon those Blessed Saints and Martyrs, now reigning triumphantly in Heaven, as would put a Man almost beyond all Patience. But I am resolved to say no more of it, but leave Mr. *H.* to ruminate upon it, and weigh with himself, whether he has done Justice to this Glorious Army of Martyrs and Confessors, in fixing so groundless and undeserved a Charge upon them.

3. It is impossible to put any fair Construction upon their Sufferings, together with the Professions they made of Duty and Submission to their Sovereigns, that will not shew them to have thought it necessarily incumbent upon them, to bear all sorts of Indignities and Torments, rather than *Resist the Higher Powers.* The Character of the Persons, and the unblemished Sincerity and Integrity they shewed in all their other Actions, challenges a belief of whatever they pleaded for themselves in this respect. But their Admonitions and Exhortations to this purpose are more express, teaching *(g) to Reverence and Honour the Emperor, as one chosen by God, and to desire and pray for his Welfare, to study to be quiet, and raise no Tumults or Commotions among their Fellow-Subjects,*

(f) Οἱ καὶ ὁμώστε ἐχώρει αὐτῷ, πᾶν εἶδος ὀνειδισμῶ καὶ κολάσεως ἀνεχόμενοι· οἱ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ὀλίγα ἡγούμενοι ἔσεσθαι πρὸς τὴ χείρονι· ὅτως ὑπεδείκνυμεν ὅτι ἐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τῦ νῦν καιρῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς, &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. *l.* 5. *c.* 1.

(g) See Sect. 2, & 3.

Subjects, to continue faithful to Almighty God, and for his ſake to ſuch as are put in Authority under him; together with their publick Declarations and ſolemn Profeſſions, that *they would not Reſiſt ſuch as ſet upon them, not accounting it lawful to kill thoſe that hurt them*; that they looked upon *Religion as what was to be defended, not by Fighting, but by Dying for it*; *not by Wickedneſs, but by a ſure Truſt in God*; that theſe Words, *he that Reſiſteth the Power, Reſiſteth the Ordinance of God, are levelled againſt ſuch as truſt to their own Strength, thinking themſelves out of danger of being called to account for it, that they might not ſeek to maintain their Ground by Reſiſtance*, and *that* David *being a King had none to fear but God*, with other like Expreſſions. And does Mr. *H.* think all theſe no Proof that they were in earneſt, and really meant that their Principles would not allow them to reſiſt their Sovereign? Let him call to mind alſo *their Praying and Entreating the Emperor, but not pretending to Fight with him*, their challenging the Enemy *to prove any amongſt them guilty of Sedition*, their *patient Submiſſion to the moſt outrageous ill Uſage, and the cruelleſt and worſt of Deaths*, and that *great Numbers of them* ſuffered thus at a time, and when in all appearance abundantly able to have defended themſelves againſt their Aſſailants, if their Religion would have admitted of it; and particularly their ſubmiſſive Behaviour towards the Apoſtate *Julian*, and eſpecially in his Expedition againſt *Perſia*; but above all, the Teſtimony this their ſubtle Enemy bare to them, that they no ſooner diſcovered the Authors of any Diſturbance in the Empire, but they readily did their part to bring them to condign Puniſhment; let him revolve theſe things in his Mind, and then let him try if he can ſuffer himſelf to perſiſt in this Perſuaſion, that *it is impoſſible to prove from hence, that it was their Opinion, that a People ought paſſively to ſubmit, to be ruined at the Will of the Prince*, or in other Terms, That they ought to venture the Loſs of all in this World, much rather than incur the dreadful Guilt of *Reſiſting God's Ordinance*, and thereby expoſe themſelves to eternal Miſery in the other. There is no Compare betwixt theſe two. And theſe

Chriſtian

Christian Heroes were so wise, as to *choose that better part which shall not be taken from them.* And having done so, it is just matter of Complaint, that Mr. *H.* should represent them as Men of this World, and whose chief Concern was the Safety and Happiness of Human Society, rather than the Service and Honour of God, and the eternal Salvation of their own Souls. But it seems he knew not how otherwise to maintain his own Hypothesis, which is especially to be taken care of, whatever the consequence be. And so much concerning his fifth Exception.

6. *As for the Christians not so much as wishing in any circumstances, for a new Emperor, it is so very hard to believe, that it may rather seem a strain of Oratory in* Tertullian, *than a Sentence to be literally understood of the whole Body of the Christians.* And if this were admitted, there is Evidence enough to do the Business without it. But however, Mr. *H.* has given good Reason why, at that time at least, this might have been strictly and literally spoken, if what he says be true, that (*a*) *it was of small importance to the Christians, what Persons were at the Head of Affairs, so equally were they hated by all, and so universally were they abused, and misrepresented to the great Men of this World.* For it was to no purpose for them to wish for a Change, if they knew beforehand, that they were to expect no Benefit by it, as Mr. *H.* here supposes.

But now if this Wish were intended, only in order to receive fresh Bounties, as was usual upon the Inauguration of a new *Cæsar*, which Mr. *H.* may easily see is the true meaning of the Expression, then there is not the least shadow of a Reason for imagining, the Christians to have been, or that they could be guilty of so mean a Thought; it being unconceivable, that such a Desire could enter into the Minds of Persons so much above this World and all its Temptations; and who therefore could never suffer such poor trifling Advantages to incline them any way to favour or desire a Change upon so slight an Account.

This

(*a*) P. 138.

This I take to be *Tertullian*'s Meaning in this place; and I am confident Mr. *H.* when he has better considered it, must own it to be so. And if this be once admitted, it will not be so *very hard to believe*, that this is no *Strain of Oratory*, but *a Sentence to be Literally understood of the whole Body of Christians.*

And yet once more, if by *not Wishing for a new Emperor*, had been meant that they did not Wish to have even their Persecuting Emperors taken away by any indirect and unlawful Means; and that they were rather for referring their Cause to God, than seeking to right themselves against such tyrannical Superiours, I can see nothing in this but what might very well become the Temper and Genius of the Gospel, and all such Professors of it, as believed it utterly unlawful, and a heinous Crime in any case, to *lift up their Hand against the Lord's Anointed.* And accordingly we read how often, and how earnestly they prayed for the Safety and Prosperity of the Emperor and his Posterity, as well as for themselves, and the rest of the Empire. Which was not like Men that thought themselves authorised, to take up Arms against them, and Depose, and Kill them, rather than permit *themselves to be ruined*, as to their Temporal Concerns, *at their Will and Pleasure.*

But the former seems rather to be the Sence intended by *Tertullian*, as appears from the preceding Words, wherein he upbraids the Heathens, that could their Breasts be seen into, (*a*) *there would presently appear a very odd Scene of New* Cæsars *one after another, dividing their Doles amongst the Crowd.* So also *Franciscus Zephyrus* paraphrases on the Words, (*b*) *For the People here mind their* Cæsar, *only so long as they reap the Fruits of his*

(*a*) Cujus non præcordia insculpta apparerent novi ac novi Cæsaris Scenam in congiario dividundo præsidentis? etiam illâ horâ quâ acclamant, *De nostris annis tibi Jupiter augeat annos.*

(*b*) Tantisper enim observat Cæsarem Plebs, quamdiu utilis est, omnisq; illa adulatio à commodis extorquetur, non à verâ proficiscitur observantiâ.

his Bounty, and all their Flattery proceeds merely from his Gifts, not from a hearty Reverence for him. And what Mr. *H.* can see in such a Wish as this, so ill grounded, and to so mean an end, that the Christians might not literally disclaim all Thoughts of it, I am yet to learn. Especially if it be remembred how heartily they both taught to Pray, and Prayed for their Persecuting Emperors, as I have fully shewn. For I can hardly suspect Mr. *H.* will pretend, that such their Professions and Prayers were not to be understood *Literally*, and as the Words most naturally import.

7. *Some other Passages, and those of a late date, only declare, that a Christian Bishop did not think Arms of Resistance so proper for his Character, as Prayers and Tears; which might as well be said with respect to a foreign Enemy, as to his own Prince: For St.* Ambrose, *in the famous Place so often cited for the Purpose of Passive Obedience, saith in so many Words*, Bishops have no other Defence; *confining what he saith to his own sacred Order.* Here Mr. *H.* pretends to answer all the Passages cited in behalf of Prayers and Tears, as the only Arms of Christians against their Sovereign. And tho' he speaks of Passages in the Plural, yet that he may the more easily triumph over them, he shrinks them all into one. *For,* says he, *St.* Ambrose, *in the famous Place so often cited for the Purpose of Passive Obedience, saith in so many Words, Bishops have no other Defence.* Where this *famous Place of St.* Ambrose *is*, he does not vouchsafe to tell us; and therefore I must acquaint such Readers as do not know it already, that it is in his fifth Tome, and his first Sermon, *Pro variis actionibus*, entituled, *De Basilicis non tradendis -- contra Auxentium Invasorem:* and his Words are these: *Adversus arma, milites, Gothos quoque, lachrymæ meæ arma sunt; talia enim munimenta sunt sacerdotis. Against Arms, Soldiers, and even the* Goths, *my Tears are my Weapons*: for these are a *Priest's best Defence.* But is this one all the Passages Mr. *H.* undertakes to answer? If he knows of others that he has said nothing to,

(a) Ibid.

to; it was not so fairly done, to impose upon the Reader, as if he had answered all. But if he does not know of others, I shall beg leave to present him with some of them. Thus therefore says S. *Cyprian* to *Cornelius*, and not so late as from Mr. *H.* might be suspected; (*a*) *Let us diligently employ our selves in continual Groans, and reiterated Prayers, for these* sunt nobis arma cœlestia, *are* not our Sacerdotal, as St. *Ambrose* speaks, but *our Heavenly Weapons, which enable us to stand and persevere courageously; these are our Spiritual Arms, and the Divine Darts that protect us.* It is true, he writes this to a Fellow-Bishop, but here is nothing in what he writes, but might befit any other Christians, as well as Bishops. And so I see not by what Logick Mr. *H.* can hope to appropriate this only to the *Sacred Order*. But *Gregory Nazianzen* is fuller to the Purpose, (*b*) when speaking of *Julian*'s excessive Enmity to the Christians, he adds, *But he was stopp'd in his career, by the Favour of God, and the Tears of the Christians*, not of the Bishops, or Priests only, but of the Christians in general, *that were plentifully shed by many of them*; τοῦτο μόνον ἐχόντων καὶ τοῦτο διώκτου φάρμακον· *this being the only Remedy they had against the Persecutor.* Agreeably whereto, at another time, having mentioned the good Success of *Hezekiah*'s Prayer against *Sennacherib*, he professed much to the same purpose, that the Christians (*c*) *only Armour, and Wall of Defence, and all the Fortress they had left them, was their Hope in God; so that being destitute of all humane help or assistance, they had none to hear their Prayers, or defeat the Threatnings of their Persecutors, but him that* (*d*) *swears against the Pride of* Jacob. Non quod non possent, sed quod nollent, &c. says Bishop *Montague*, in his Notes upon the Place; *Not because they could not, but because they would not. For they had Force enough to restrain the Tyrant, as St.* Augustin *teaches, and our Author shews, when he declares the Christian Religion to be so widely diffused, and to have taken such deep Rooting, as that it seems in no danger*

(*a*) Epist. 60. (*b*) Στηλιτευτ. α'. p. 57.
(*c*) Στηλ. ε'. p. 100. (*d*) Amos. 6. 8.

danger of being extirpated, without the Empire's falling together with it. But they had learned Patience in the School of Christ, as being recommended to them both by his Doctrine, and by his Example, not to put all things into Combustion, as too many since have been apt to do. So likewise says St. *Chrysostom*, to his Flock at *Constantinople*; (*d*) *Let us fall on our knees to the King, or rather let us beseech our most gracious God, to mitigate the King's Rage, and soften his Heart, and incline him to favour and pity us.* Mr. *H.* perhaps may look upon this as a very wrong method, and a dangerous course, and that the good Bishop ought to have had more regard to the Welfare of the Society; and that he would have done much better to excite the People to Arms, rather than Prayers. But I cannot help that. S. *Chrysostom* it seems was another sort of Christian, and a Friend to Passive Obedience, and was of opinion that Prayers to God, and Intreaties to the King, were better becoming the Professors of the Gospel, and like to turn to better Account with them. But to return to S. *Ambrose*, I may appeal even to him against Mr. *H.* who commends his People of *Milan* in such a manner, for Praying and Beseeching the Emperor, as makes it manifest, he accounted of *Prayers and Tears* not as the Arms of the Clergy only, tho' theirs more peculiarly, but as well suiting with other Christians also. His Words are these: (*e*) *What could be said better by Christian Men, than what the Holy Ghost has spoken to day in you?* Rogamus Auguste, non pugnamus; non timemus, sed rogamus: *We beseech thee O Emperor, we do not fight against thee; We are not so affrighted, but that we still beseech thee:* (*f*) *This was to act like Christians, to seek both Peace and Faith*; but neither of them at the Loss, or by a Breach of the other. They would not suffer themselves to be scared out of their Allegiance, or to fly to any other Course, but Supplications

(*d*) Εἰς τ' Εὐτεόπ. ὕπατον. To. 8. p. 70.

(*e*) Epist. l. 2. ep. 14.

(*f*) Hoc Christianos decet, ut & tranquillitas pacis optetur & fidei, veritatisq; constantia nec mortis revocetur periculo.

cations and Intreaties; and this S. *Ambroſe* commends, as what well became the Followers of the Meek and Bleſſed *Jeſus*. Whence it is evident S. *Ambroſe* thought the Prayers of the People entreating the Emperor, no leſs proper Arms for them, than thoſe the Biſhops and Prieſts offered up to God were for them. But what I inſiſt upon as moſt material in this Paſſage, is his declaring ſo expreſsly againſt Fighting with the Emperor; which it could not be expected he would have done, if he had had as little regard for the Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance, as Mr. *H.* So that after all, we have the Teſtimony of this S. *Ambroſe*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*, and S. *Chryſoſtom* in the Fourth Century, and S. *Cyprian* in the Third, in favour of this exploded Preſcription of *Prayers and Tears*, as much more agreeable to the Chriſtian Inſtitution, than *Arms of Reſiſtance* againſt our Sovereign. Which, if duly conſidered, *may, I hope, help Mr.* H. *to form a right Judgment in this matter.*

8. (*g*) *The two Principal Teſtimonies concerning the the Practice and Principles of the Primitive Chriſtians, and thoſe on which the main ſtreſs is laid by the beſt of Writers in Favour of Paſſive Obedience, are the Accounts given by* Tertullian *and* S. Cyprian. *What is ſaid to be affirmed by theſe two Primitive Writers amounts to this; That the Chriſtians were barbarouſly uſed by the Emperors, and thoſe who acted under them; that they were very numerous, and able to defend themſelves againſt the violent Invaſion of their Rights and Lives; but notwithſtanding this, that they never reſiſted their Superiors, or by Force guarded themſelves againſt their unjuſt Perſecutions. And from hence it is concluded by SOME, that Reſiſtance to Princes, is in all caſes unlawful.* Now I have ſhewn the truth of this from *Euſebius*, and the other Hiſtorians, from *Lactantius*, S. *Auguſtine* and others, particularly from theſe two here named, and from *Pliny* and *Julian* amongſt the Heathens: all whom Mr. *H.* has taken no notice of, as if *Tertullian* and S. *Cyprian* had been all the Witneſſes that could be produced in this Matter. Whereas there is

(*g*) P. 138, 139.

very good Evidence, and such as is by no means to be got over, if these two he instances in, were wholly set aside. So that it is plain the Method he has taken is wrong, and would not *help us to form a right Judgment in this Matter*, even tho' all he desires about it were granted him. But there is no reason for such a grant; for not only these two eminent Writers are not to be got over, as he pretends, but their Testimony is well corroborated by the concurrent Suffrage of others, both Friends and Enemies: Which is as much as those SOME, who hence conclude the Unlawfulness of Resistance, can possibly desire. However, Mr. *H. has a few Observations to offer*, which must not be passed by.

1. The First is, that (*a*) Tertullian, *in the very same places, in which he gives this account of the Behaviour of the Christians in his time, under Persecution, gives likewise such an account of their Behaviour, in many other respects, as is allowed by the Patrons of Passive Obedience to be such as other Christians are not obliged to imitate, and in some cases such as cannot be justified.* Now admit this to be so as here objected, yet in the first place, this Objection concerns *Tertullian* only, and so S. *Cyprian*'s Testimony might be of force notwithstanding any thing here offered; and in the next place this will by no means prove, that the several Passages referred to in *Tertullian*, do not testify the Christians strong enough to have defended themselves against the Forces of the Empire, if they had been at liberty to try their Strength. This I say upon supposition of *Tertullian*'s having *in many other respects* represented the Christians Behaviour to be such as other Christians are not obliged to imitate. But now if a Man should ask, what are these many Failures of the Primitive Christians, which are not to be imitated, Mr. *H.* instances particularly in one only, that *They ran unnecessarily to Torments.* And it is true, sometimes they did so. But this was so far from being a constant, unanimous, and universal Practice amongst them, that some of them expressly declare against bringing these Evils

(*a*) P. 139.

Evils needlesly upon themselves. As particularly; *Origen* professes (*a*) against *Celsus*, Οὐ μεμήναμεν, ἐπ' ὀρμῶμεν καθ' ἑαυτῶν, &c. *We are not so mad, as needlesly to provoke the Anger of the King or Potentate against ourselves, and so wilfully expose ourselves, to Stripes, or Tortures, or Deaths.* And (*b*) *Polycarp* before him, Οὐκ ἐπαινοῦμεν τὰς προσιόντας ἑαυτοῖς, &c. or as the learned Dr. *Smith* conjectures, προσθέντας ἑαυτὸς, *We do not think those to be commended who offer themselves of their own accord, but those*, as the Latin Translation adds, *who being unwillingly discovered are not afraid of suffering. This*, says he, *is all that the Gospel requires.* And when it was grown too common, Canons were thought necessary to be made against it, to prevent the like for the future. And till Mr. *H.* can shew the like Prohibitions of Non-resistance, I hope he will not insist upon these as parallel Instances; nor desire that they should be thought to have had a like universal Consent of all Christians. Yet till this be made out, which never can be, the overforward Zeal of some in the one case, will be no excuse for the disloyal and unchristian Liberty taken by any in the other.

2. It is likewise objected, *that neither* Tertullian *nor S.* Cyprian *say any thing, from which it may certainly be concluded, that the number of Christians was great enough, to be a match for the regulated Forces of their Emperors, and the rest of their Fellow-Subjects.* Mr. *H.* then, *I must conclude, has found out a new way of rendering these Words of* Tertullian, (*c*) Cui bello non Idonei? non Prompti fuissemus? *In one Night's space*, says the Father, *by the help only of a few Torches, we could revenge ourselves to the full, if it were lawful for us to repay one Wrong for another. But God forbid that this Divine Sect should seek thus* (*d*) *to set all on fire, as others perhaps in like circumstances would have done, by way of Retaliation for the many Injuries received, or should refuse to suffer what is sent to try them.* Nay farther, *would we but act as open Enemies, not as private*

(*a*) L. 8. p. 20. (*b*) De Polycarpi Martyrio. *c.* 4.
(*c*) Apol. c. 37.
(*d*) Absit ut igni humano vindicetur Divina Secta.

Conſpirators, could we want Forces and Troops? Do ye reckon the Moors *and* Marcomans, *the* Parthians, *and the People of any of thoſe Nations you have lately conquered, who are confined to the Bounds of their ſingle Country, to be more than the Chriſtians who are ſpread over the face of all the Earth? (a) We are but of yeſterday, and yet have already filled all places amongſt you, your Cities, Iſles, Caſtles, Corporations, Councils, Camps, Wards, Companies, the Senate, the Forum, leaving nothing void of us but the Temples, which we deſire to have nothing to do with. And now for what War are we not ſufficient and in readineſs? Eſpecially conſidering that, though we were fewer in Number than we really are, yet the Uſage we have met with, has diſarmed Death of all its Terrour, and diſpoſed us willingly to meet it; unleſs our Religion had taught us rather to be killed, than kill.* Here *Tertullian* not only poſitively declares the Chriſtians in a good condition for making War upon their Emperors; that they could not only have done them irreparable Damage, by clandeſtine unforeſeen Devices, but were able to bear up againſt them in the open Field; eſpecially remembring how deſperate the Cruelties they underwent might be ſuppoſed to have made them, and that ſuch who value not their own Lives may eaſily be Maſters of others. What then could make them ſo quiet and contented in ſuch uncomfortable Circumſtances? This he tells us in the next Words. They were under the reſtraint of their Religion, which had taught them to ſubmit, though to the Death, rather than take away the Lives even of their hotteſt Perſecutors. And after all is this no Proof, that they were numerous enough to have vindicated themſelves, if they had thought Reſiſtance lawful? It ſeems it is not with Mr. *H.* Nor do I know what Words would ſatisfy him, that the State of the Caſe was really and truly, as *Tertullian* repreſents it. But this one would think were enough, to perſuade any unbyaſſed Perſon, that the Chriſtians had ſufficient Temptation to Reſiſt, and were ſufficiently enabled

(a) *So I read it with* Rigaltius; *though* Zephyrus *and* Pamelius *have it* Hesterni ſumus Externi ſumus.

enabled for it, if a ſenſe of their Duty had not withheld them from it.

Thus Mr. *H.* contradicts the plain poſitive Evidence of *Tertullian.* As to S. *Cyprian* he tells us, (*a*) *All that can be gathered from what he ſays, is, that in thoſe Parts he ſpeaks of, he thought the Chriſtians were numerous enough, to reſcue one another out of the Hands of their Perſecutors, and to revenge themſelves upon them.* And who but Mr. *H.* would not take this for a ſufficient Proof, of their Ability to Reſiſt their mercileſs Governors, in order to ſuch a Reſcue? If they were *numerous enough* to make head againſt their Perſecutors, as Mr. *H.* allows, this is all I deſire of him. And after ſuch a Conceſſion Mr. *H.* may flouriſh with his Eloquence, and make S. *Cyprian* write as like a *Poet* as *Tertullian.* Yet at laſt he muſt be forced to acknowledge, that they both made theſe Boaſts, to ſuch as may well be conceived the moſt competent Judges that could be of the Truth of what they affirmed, and who in all probability would have convinced them to their coſt, of the falſhood of their Plea, if they had not known it true. And this ſame S. *Cyprian* aſſigns another cauſe of their Patience and Submiſſion, that it proceeded not from their Inability to ſtand upon their own Defence, but their Truſt in God to take care of them, and a Reſolution conſequent hereupon, to leave all Vengeance to God, to whom it properly belongs. He exhorts *Demetrian* (*b*) to leave off perſecuting the *Servants of God and Chriſt*, quos ultio divina defendit, *whom the Divine Vengeance protects. Hence therefore* he profeſſes, *None of us when ſeized makes any Reſiſtance, or ſets himſelf to be even with you for your unjuſt Violence; though you ſee our Multitudes and Strength.* It was ſomewhat ſurprizing, that Mr. *H.* ſhould take S. *Cyprian* for ſo weak an Advocate, as to provoke the Magiſtrate by the noiſe of ſuch falſe Muſters, as were the likelieſt means he could pitch upon to put their Enemies upon thoſe Cruelties he was endeavouring to ſtave off.

(*a*) Ibid.
(*b*) Ad Demetrian. *p.* 192.

However still (*a*) Mr. *H.* is not satisfied that the Christians were in a condition to make a defensive War against the Emperor's Armies. Yet be he as incredulous as he pleases, I cannot but think these two Fathers to have understood their own case, better than he can pretend to do, and since they speak so plain, I hope it will be no fault for others to believe them, whether Mr. *H.* do or no.

But Mr. *H.* excepts to *Tertullian*'s Evidence from another Saying of his. *For*, says he in another place, *the utmost he can permit himself to say of* Christians, *is that they were* (*b*) pars pene major Civitatis cujusq; *almost the greatest part of every City.* Now what if he did say so? Is this any Contradiction to what either himself or S. *Cyprian* says? Is it not rather a Confirmation of it? S. *Cyprian* tells how Numerous and Strong they were; and *Tertullian* says they had filled all Places and Parts of the Empire, and now he adds they were not only dispersed through all their Cities, but there was hardly a City of which they were not the greater part. And is this a Proof that they wanted Numbers? I doubt Mr. *H.* talks here more like *a Poet* than *Tertullian*, who plainly enough asserts their great Power and Strength. So that I may very well put his own Question before mentioned, *For what War were they not fit and ready?* Especially considering how their Persecutors might have provoked them; and again that had a War been once begun, no one now knows what Assistance they might reasonably have promised themselves, from others who were far enough from being Christians, but yet sometimes were partakers with them in the Wrongs they suffered, and so might have Ends of their own to serve by a Revolution, either to deliver them from some Pressure they groaned under, or to take their Revenge upon such as had tyrannized over them, or to fish in troubled Waters, and try if they could make their Fortunes out of the Publick Wreck. And which was of much greater weight than all these Considerations put toge-

(*a*) P. 140. (*b*) Ad Scap. *c.* 2.

together, if they had been acquainted with Mr. *H.*'s discovery not only of the Lawfulness of Resistance, but that it was a Christian Duty, and well-pleasing to Almighty God, they might have expected his Providence to assist and defend them, and fight abundantly more successfully for them against their Enemies, than all their own Forces and Arms, or whatsoever Human Means.

Mr. *H.* adds, *The same might be said of the French Protestants; and yet considering all things, it doth not appear that they could pretend to be an equal Match for their King, and all his Armies and Adherents.* And who ever said they were? It is true they were a very considerable Body, and made up a good part of the Kingdom, as every one knows, that knows any thing of them; but yet they were at most, as I am well informed, not a tenth part of the Whole. Nor did any of them ever presume to talk to their Governors, as these Christians did to theirs. If they had, they would soon have found to their cost, that they were not in a condition to support themselves against the rest, and so might have hastened those Calamities upon themselves, which they have since felt. From whence every one may see, how far these Cases are from being parallel, inasmuch as the Numbers of these latter seem by no means to bear proportion to those of the former. Neither did they ever pretend to insist upon any such Plea before their Governors, as the others freely did, and with such Confidence as must have turned to their exceeding Disadvantage, if what they said had not been true.

3. Mr. *H.* undertakes to enquire into *the Reasons on which this Behaviour of the Christians was founded*; and urges (*a*) that *we do not find that these Writers do in any of the Passages cited from them, ever so much as intimate that their Persecutors had the least degree of Divine Authority, in their unjust Proceedings against them, or that they ever fixed their Obligation to that* Passive Obedience *which they exercised, upon the* Divine Right *of their Emperors.*

(*a*) P. 141.

But did they not teach to Submit, and not Resist their Persecuting Emperors, and this for God's sake, and out of Obedience to the Laws of the Gospel? They were under no necessity to use only just those Expressions Mr. *H.* would have put into their Mouths, whilst they had others that very well answered their Design. If they pleaded to their Governors that they were their best Subjects, and durst not be otherwise, this was enough to let us see, what their Notion of Resistance was, though they might not think fit to quote the Words of Scripture to those who knew nothing of them. Which Mr. *H.* if he pleases, may *take notice of in a particular manner.* Both *Tertullian* and S. *Cyprian* both taught Passive Obedience, and put it in practice under their greatest Trials and Oppression; and it is a hard case if this be not enough to shew what their Opinion was of it. And if they or either of them judged it propereſt, in their Pleas for themselves, for Reasons they have not thought it necessary to acquaint us with, to insist rather upon the general Doctrines of an universal Love and Kindness, than upon the more express Prohibitions of Resistance that are to be found in Scripture, this will never prove that that Non-resistance which they taught both by their Doctrines and their Lives, was not then, or is not now a necessary part of our Religion. *We do not find*, says Mr. *H.* that *they alledge the celebrated Passage of S.* Paul, Rom. 13. 1, &c. *to shew the Obligation they were under to Non-resistance, and this he thinks ought to be taken notice of in a particular manner.* But why I pray? Was it not sufficient? Indeed was it not far better, to put those they spake, or wrote to, in mind of the wonderful Influence their Religion had upon them, to make them patient and submissive, quiet and obedient in all Cases, never presuming, upon whatever Provocation, to resist Themselves, or disturb their Government, or encourage any else to do it? When their Governors saw them thus universally compliant, choosing rather to suffer to the utmost, than try to rescue themselves by any manner of Force, this would be an ocular Demonstration of their immovable adherence to the Precepts of

their

their Religion. And to put these Governors in mind of such their truly Christian Behaviour, was a more likely way to ingratiate themselves with them, than quoting the Apostle's Words to those, who had no regard for Scripture, could be. And if these Writers made choice of the wiser and better method of vindicating themselves, Mr. *H.* may *take notice of it* as much as he pleases; but he will never be able to prove from hence, that the Apostle's Doctrine was not a Rule to them, how to behave themselves in relation to the Higher Powers, and that their Non-resistance did not proceed from this, and other Passages to the same effect in Scripture.

But here Mr. *H.* has made a strange Discovery, of (*a*) *something truly, which one would hardly believe*, and yet may be inferred from these Testimonies. Well, I am always desirous to be informed; and let us see therefore what this strange Inference is, that is so lately come to light. It is no other than this, *That the Christians of those Days founded their* Non-resistance *upon such Principles, and such Interpretations, as did in effect take away from themselves the liberty of Self-defence, in all possible Cases.* I confess it would have been very surprizing, and very wonderful, if he could have discovered, that they had set up for the Doctrine of Resistance, as he does. But this he could not pretend. Their being of a contrary Persuasion was so flagrant a Truth, that it was not to be denied; and so he is necessitated to own they had *Principles of Non-resistance*. Only he is of opinion that these Principles were such, *as did in effect take away the liberty of Self-defence* in all Cases. What he finds in S. *Cyprian* to ground this Assertion upon, I do not know. He owns, I grant, that they referred their Cause to Almighty God, and left it to him to avenge their Injuries; but this is no Proof that they were obliged to do so in any case, where they were not forbidden to defend themselves. *Tertullian*, it is true, insists more upon the general Rules of loving, and wishing well to all Men; and that they were not only no Enemies to the Empe-

(*a*) P. 142.

Emperor, but even to no one elſe. But does he ſay this was the only Reaſon of their Non-reſiſtance? By no means. And yet if he had, it would not follow, that our Religion may not allow to Reſiſt ſome upon occaſion, and yet reſtrain us from Reſiſting others. So that he has yet ſhewn no Reaſon, for diſallowing the truth of thoſe Principles, upon which the Practice of the Primitive Chriſtians was founded. And ſo long as he allows Non-reſiſtance to have been their Practice, and has not proved the Principles here mentioned, to be all it was founded upon, I may leave it to himſelf to reflect, how little he has done towards the invalidating their Teſtimony. And this I will aſſure him, that let him but once publickly own and invite to this Duty of Non-reſiſtance, as a neceſſary part of Chriſtianity, and what our Lord's Diſciples are all obliged to, as they will diſcharge the Profeſſion they have taken upon themſelves, with a good Conſcience, and I will have no farther Diſpute with him about it, though he could not prevail with himſelf, to urge all the Arguments for it, that I have made uſe of in this Tract.

4. He appeals to *Origen* as a favourer of this Doctrine of Reſiſtance; but to how little purpoſe will eaſily be made apparent. *Origen* was noted for ſome Singularities of Opinion, and eſpecially as to the Eternal Torments of Hell. And if he had been ſingular too in the Inſtance before us, his Judgment would have been the leſs valuable upon this account. But there is no cauſe for ſuch a Suppoſition concerning Reſiſtance. Though Mr. *H.* notes it, (*a*) as *very remarkable, that* Origen *ſhould mention that celebrated Paſſage of S.* Paul, Rom. 13. 1, &c. *with ſuch a Remark, as would incline one to think, that all the Primitive Chriſtians did not ſee any ſuch unlimited Non-reſiſtance in it, as many have done ſince.* This I confeſs is ſomewhat ſtrange, that *Origen*, the ſame *Origen*, who, to uſe Mr. *H.*'s (*b*) own Words, *challenged* Celſus, *that great Enemy to* Chriſtians, *to name any* Sedition, *or* Tumult, *in which the* Chriſtians *were concerned, and is by ſome*

(*a*) P. 144. (*b*) Ibid.

some alledged for this in Defence of Passive Obedience; it is somewhat strange, I say, that he should give any reason to suspect that an unlimited Non-resistance was not taught in this place of the Apostle. However, let us attend to what he writes upon this subject. It seems the learned and indefatigable Dr. *Whitby*, in his Annotations on this Text of S. *Paul*, observes, *that* Origen *having these Words in his Dissertation against* Celsus, (*a*) *confesses it is a place capable of much Disquisition, by reason of such Princes as govern Cruelly and Tyrannically, or who by reason of their Power fall into Effeminacy, and carnal Pleasures.* This Passage Mr. *H.* presses here with this observation, which might have been learned from the Doctor too, *That he would not at present undertake to give an exact account of it. From whence he thinks it manifest, not only that many of the first Christians doubted, whether the Subjection preached by S.* Paul *was due, in point of Conscience, to Tyrants and Oppressors; but also that* Origen *himself, when he wrote this, did not believe it to be so.* This I am afraid is carrying the matter somewhat too far; and how *manifest* soever Mr. *H.* may think such a Consequence to be, I must confess myself so blind as not to see it, though I have tried all the ways I can to make it out. For that *Origen* did believe Tyrants irresistible, is to me much more *manifest*, not only from these Passages cited before (*b*) out of him, but more especially from his (*c*) Commentary upon these Words of the Apostle, as we have them in the Latin Edition of *Joannes Parvus*. For the Apostle having taught, *there is no Power but of God*, he takes occasion from hence to argue in the following manner: *Perhaps some will say, what then? Is that Power which persecutes the Servants of God, impugns the Faith, subverts Religion, is this from God? To this we will briefly answer: Every body knows that our Sight and Hearing, and other Senses are given us by God. But when by God's Gift they are put in our power, it is in our power to use them either to good or bad Purposes; and yet this is no impeachment of God's Justice, that being given us with a good Intent, we yet abuse them*

(*a*) L. 8. p. 421. (*b*) P. 47, & p. 136.
(*c*) In ep. ad Rom. *cap.* 13. *lib.* 9.

them to wicked and ungodly Purposes. In like manner all Power is given by God, for the Punishment of evil doers, but the Praise of them that do well, as the same Apostle says just after. Well, but *what if they contradict the Character here laid down by S.* Paul, *and are not a Terrour to evil works, but to good; are not the Ministers of Good to the Virtuous, and of Vengeance to the Wicked only?* In this case says Origen, *the heavy Judgment of God will overtake those, who manage the Power committed to them, according to their own sinful Imaginations, and not according to the Divine Laws.* Where he assures such, God Almighty will call them to account, for their impious Abuse of his Authority *entrusted* with them, without any the least intimation of the Peoples Right to rise up against them. Now I appeal to Mr. *H.* whether in writing a Commentary upon these Words, he would have delivered himself as *Origen* does here? And whether he would not have taken a quite contrary course, and instead of threatening such evil Magistrates only with the Divine Vengeance, he would not have told them rather that besides the heavy Punishment to be expected in the other World, they ought to remember that they had lost their Authority in this, *and could not be called God's Vicegerents without the highest Prophaneß; and so* a Passive Non-resistance to them *would appear, upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of God, than the contrary?* This Mr. *H.* must have told them, if he would have spoken consonantly to his own Doctrine. But *Origen* did nothing less; He owned their Authority to be still as much from God, as our Senses are, when we abuse them to other Purposes than they were given us for, and warns them to take care of provoking God, lest so they bring upon themselves an irreparable Destruction, without any hint of an account to be given to their Subjects of their Misgovernment. And whilst *Origen* and Mr. *H.* so plainly interfere, and disagree in their management of this Portion of Scripture, it is hard to conceive they should both have the same Notion of Resistance, as Mr. *H.* would have it thought. But this I will say for him, he is the most expert at reconciling

Con-

Contradictions, of any one I have ever met with. And to confirm what I have here said concerning *Origen*, it may farther be observed, that treating of the next Verse of this Chapter, he condemns complying with such Rulers, as take upon them to persecute the Faith, and requires to obey God rather than them; but mentions not one word of any liberty, their Subjects had to revenge the Ills they suffered by them. And again on the fifth Verse professes, that had not those who believed in Christ been subject to the temporal Powers, and paid them not only their Tribute, but that Fear and Honour which was due to them, they had deservedly provoked their Rulers and Governors to turn their Arms against them; *& persecutores quidem suos excusabiles, semet ipsos verò culpabiles redderent*, they would have taken the blame from their Persecutors, and laid it upon themselves. Which is not spoken like one who was a friend to Resistance upon occasion. So that when *Origen* complains of the Difficulties that may arise, in relation to tyrannical and persecuting Princes, which he would not take upon him to enquire into at that time, as perhaps not thinking it to his present purpose, or as hoping for a more convenient opportunity of doing it, or rather as supposing what he had said upon the Words themselves, to be a sufficient declaration of his Mind, as he seems to have thought it, or for whatsoever other Reason, I cannot see how this can any way prove the Lawfulness of Resisting such Princes. It is possible what *Origen* meant might relate to the Care to be taken, and the Circumspection to be used, by those that lived under bad Governors, that so they might not incur their Displeasure, and so come to feel the sad Effects of it. And if this be all that was here intended, as it may be for ought Mr. *H.* can shew to the contrary, and perhaps he will be of opinion that it is so, if he look back to the foregoing Words: If this, I say, be the case, I am confident, that he himself will yield it is of very little service to the purpose of Resistance. And yet again, if *Origen* were supposed to have been in his own private Opinion for Resistance, which he no way appears to

have

have been, it were not so very justly done of Mr. *H.* to conclude from him alone that *MANY of the first Christians* concurred herein with him, whilst he says no such thing. When a Man speaks only his own Thoughts, without mentioning any one besides, it is too much to infer from thence, that *it is manifest* this was a common and usual Persuasion, and that *Many* others had come into it. Wherefore all I can collect from this Inference of Mr. *H.* is, that though he expresses himself ingeniously and smoothly, it will be very hard to prove that he argues closely. *Origen* speaks only his own Sense, and does not say that *Many* others were of the same Mind; and yet if he had, here is nothing to prove that either he, or they were for the Doctrine of Resistance.

Next comes a Passage of S. (*a*) *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*; but such as must have a very wrong Sense put upon it, to prevent its being a good Evidence against Resistance. The Words are these: (*b*) Δεδιδάγμεθα ἀξ χαῖς ἢ ἐξουσίαις ὑπὸ τῦ Θεῦ τεταγμέναις τιμὴν κατὰ τὸ πρέπον, τὴν μὴ βλάπτουσαν ἡμᾶς, ἀπονέμειν, *We are taught to give to* Rulers, *and the* Powers *ordained by God, as becomes us, such Honour as doth not hurt ourselves. This* says Mr. *H. is plainly said with reference to the same place of S.* Paul's Epistle *to the* Romans; *of which it is indeed too loose an Interpretation.* But how if it be no *Interpretation*, and have no *reference* at all to this place? There is but one Phrase in it that in the least looks that way; and this will do Mr. *H.* little service, that is, his calling the Magistrates by the Name of *the Powers ordained by God.* Setting aside this, here is not a syllable that seems to have any relation to that Text. For the Martyr says not a word about not resisting with any sort of Force, but only of paying no more Honour, *τὴν τιμὴν*, than they could pay with a safe Conscience. And what there is in this to entitle it to the Character, of an Interpretation of those Words of S. *Paul*, is more than I can possibly discover, and needs some of Mr. *H.*'s Wit and Penetration to make it out. How-

(*a*) P. 145.

(*b*) Eccles. *Smyrnens.* Epist. de S. *Polycarpi* Martyrio. *c.* 10.

However as if what he says had had an appearance of Truth, he proceeds to build upon it what he would have had the Martyr say. For he lays it down as undoubtedly true, (though it is undoubtedly so, that these Words afford no ground at all for it,) that *this manifestly shews that there were* Christians *and* Martyrs, *amongst the immediate Successors of the* Apostles, *who did not imagine that S.* Paul *had obliged them to Subjection in all possible* Cases: *and who interpreted his Rules about the behaviour of* Subjects, *so as to leave them even greater* Liberty, *than what is given them in his Sermon.* And then he triumphantly tells us, *Here are two expreſs and early* Testimonies, *making it highly probable that the* Christians *of the first Ages, did not interpret the Precepts of S.* Paul *concerning* Subjection *to the* Higher Powers, *so as not to allow the Lawfulneſs of* Resistance *in some* Cases. The former of these I have fully examined, and have shewn that Mr. *H.* has no cause to boast of *Origen*, as if he were on his side. I have also noted, that this Passage of *S. Polycarp* is neither for nor against him; and for this very good reason, because it is perfectly foreign to the matter now under debate. And now to press the Observation a little farther; here is nothing in the whole Passage about a Christian's Sufferings, and his Duty of Non-resistance; and all the Obedience that can be imagined to be implied in it, is *Active* only. It is *Honouring* the Emperor that is spoken of, and which the good Bishop professes they were ready to perform, so far as they reasonably and innocently could. And if this must be called Obedience, I will not contend about a Word, whenever I can possibly avoid it. However this I am sure of, *Passive Obedience* it can in no wise be; though it ought to have been so, to make it at all to Mr. *H.*'s purpose. The Case in short was this: *Polycarp* was called upon by the Proconsul to *Swear by Cæsar's Fortune*, which he utterly refused; yet with this Declaration in behalf of himself and the others of his Religion, that they *had learned to pay, to the Principalities and Powers ordained by God, as was most just, all the Honour they could with safety to themselves*, that is to say, to their Souls, and their

Eternal

Eternal Welfare, as I have before (*a*) observed. This it seems somebody had (*b*) before signified to Mr. *H.* and upon it he seems to be sensible he had mistaken the Sence of the place; but yet cannot find in his heart to *retract it.* He tells us, *It is objected that I have mistaken S.* Polycarp. *Be it so, it is of small importance, if so be I have not mistaken S.* Paul. But is this a Proof he has not mistaken S. *Paul?* Or must it necessarily be concluded that he has not, though without any Proof, nay against all the Proof I have brought to the contrary? I know no particular Privilege Mr. *H.* has above other Men, that should authorize him to expect this, and hope therefore that I may be thought pardonable, if I cannot give so easy an assent to so precarious a Claim. However, without any Proof that he has not mistaken S. *Paul*, as he did S. *Polycarp*, he proceeds, and tells us, *The Cause I have undertaken will not suffer by this.* Right, if he mean that this is not the *Cardo Controversiæ.* But that it will in no respect *suffer by it*, is not true, for it must suffer the Loss of what ever advantage was intended it by this mistaken Citation. This is unquestionable. But let us see what follows. *And for myself I am sure I was not wilfully guilty of mistaking, or misapplying what he saith in the Passage referred to.* Nor do I know any one that ever said his Mistake was wilful. All that I can find concerning his former Informant, or that I now pretend, is that the place is quite mistaken, and does not relate to the business in hand; and it does not make it no mistake, that he did not wilfully fall into it.

And now after this Apology for his Error, who would not have expected that he should have quitted this Passage, and sought for some better Evidence? This had been natural enough for any one to conceive. But Mr. *H.* knows better things. If the Words do not of themselves speak on his Side, he can wrest and torture them till he has brought them to his Beck, just as he did those of this Text. To this end he affirms

(*a*) P. 42, 43.
(*b*) *See Pref. to his second Edition.* p. XXXVIII.

affirms, *It is manifest of S.* Polycarp, *that at a time when it was for his Interest, and for the Interest of the Christian Religion, that he should speak as highly as possible of the Obedience to Magistrates, he is far from representing S.* Paul, *and the* Christian Religion, *as some Persons have since done; but is content with a general and loose Expression concerning the* Obedience *required by it.* Which makes it necessary for me to remind him of what I have already proved, that these Words relate not to those of S. *Paul*, as indeed they do not; but rather to the first Commandment, or those Words of our Blessed Saviour, (*a*) *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*; or any other of those Texts either in the Old and New Testament, which forbid paying Divine Worship to any other than God only. And when he was Pleading upon this Point with the Proconsul, it would have been an unreasonable thing to fancy that he must needs leave the Business he was upon, and fall upon an unseasonable Discourse about Loyalty to Princes, to settle and extend the Bounds and Extent of that. This I dare say is a Task, that none but Mr. *H.* would have pretended to impose upon him.

But *he contented himself with a very general* and *loose Expression concerning Obedience* to Government. Be it so; then all that follows from hence is, that he did not argue like a Disputant. And no wonder, considering that Disputation was not his Business. It is much better, that he spake like a true Christian, and a devout Father of the Church; like one that was ready to sacrifice all for his Saviour, and for preserving a good Conscience, under all the Temptations he met with to the contrary; professing to the Proconsul, the chief Magistrate of the Place under the Emperor, that he was ready prepared to pay all the Obedience that was consistent with his Duty to his superiour Lord and Master, was willing to comply with (*a*) all the Lawful Commands of his

M Earthly

(*a*) S. Mat. 4. 10.

(*b*) *Thus likewise speak* Tertullian *and S.* Basil; *both whom Mr.* H. *if he had pleased, might as well have pressed on his side*; *and*

Earthly Governors, though not with such as endangered his Eternal Salvation: He had the Fear of God before his Eyes, and would not offend him by any Idolatrous and Forbidden Worship, whatever he might suffer for it in this World. But as for any other sort of Honour or Obedience, such as was proper and becoming, καὶ τὸ πρέπον, that is to say, as best suited with their holy Religion, this he would never be backward to pay. His great Concern was the Salvation of his immortal Soul, and so long as nothing Destructive of this was required, he would not fail to shew himself a very loyal and dutiful Subject. But when a Subjection was exacted which would hurt him in the most Sensible Part, would violate his Conscience, and expose him to the eternal Indignation of Almighty God, then he thought it time to look about him, and do nothing that might prove of such pernicious Consequence, though he suffered ever so much for it at the present. This is the natural and genuine meaning of this good Bishop's Answer, and it cannot be wrested to another Sence, with any shew of Reason. And this Interpretation is farther confirmed by the Words immediately following: Ὁ δὲ ἀνθύπατος πρὸς αὐτὸν, &c. *Hereupon the Proconsul told him; I have my Beasts at hand, which will immediately tear you limb from limb, if I but command you to be delivered to them: And I will do it, unless you change your Behaviour, and pay more regard to my Orders.* Whereto the Saint returns Answer, not that if he were able he would prevent his Cruelties, by calling

---

and each of them would have done him as much service, as this devout Martyr, that is to say, none at all. Satis præscriptum habemus, &c. *says the former*, It is plainly enough enjoined us, as we are very sensible, that we ought to pay all Subjection according to the Apostle's Direction, being subject to Principalities, and Powers, and Magistrates, provided we transgress not our Bounds, so as to defile ourselves with any Idolatrous Compliance. *De Idololatr.* c. 15. *And to the same purpose the latter teaches*, That it is our Duty to be subject to the Higher Powers, ἐν οἷς ἂν ἐντολὴ θεοῦ μὴ ἐμποδίζῃ, whilst they interfere not with any Divine Law. *Moral. Reg.* 79.

calling him to an account for them; not that he would make any Oppoſition againſt him, nor would encourage others to do it; but as became a ſincere, devout, good Chriſtian, *Call them*, ſays he, *for my Mind is fixed.* And when threatened again, that ſince he ſo unconcernedly ſlighted the Beaſts, he ſhould be caſt into the Fire till reduced to Aſhes, if he would not comply, he returns no other Anſwer but this; Πῦρ ἀπειλᾷς τὸ πρὸς ὥραν καιόμενον, &c. *Alas! all the Fire you have to terrify me with, is only ſuch as burns for a little time, and will preſently go out: But you do not know that God has prepared another more laſting, an inextinguiſhable, eternal Fire, for the Puniſhment of ſuch as tranſgreſs his Divine Laws: Make no delay therefore, but do with me what you will.* This is a plain and true account of what paſſed between the Proconſul and this holy Martyr. And would it not ſadly puzzle a Man of leſs Ingenuity than Mr. *H.* to find out how this can poſſibly ſerve the Doctrine of Reſiſtance? ſince every one muſt preſently ſee, that it points directly at another Life, and the grand Concern Chriſtians have to make ſure of a happy Eſtate in that, but has not the leaſt mention of the Safety and Welfare of this, nor one ſyllable concerning that Good of the Community, which Mr. *H.* makes the only Rule of his Submiſſion.

Yet he purſues his Deſign, and tells us farther, *It is manifeſt that in the Paſſage referred to, he hath* Rom. 13. 1. *in view, and that this* holy Martyr *thinks it ſufficient to tell the Proconſul, that the Obedience taught and enjoined in that Paſſage, is* κατὰ τὸ μέτριον, *and ſuch as doth not hurt ourſelves. Doth this look as if he thought Abſolute Obedience of any ſort required by S.* Paul? *Nay, doth it not appear, that it was his Opinion, that the* Honour *and* Obedience *of any ſort here required by S.* Paul, *was only ſuch as doth not hurt ourſelves?* Well, ſince Mr. *H.* is once in, I find he is reſolved to wade through thick and thin, and nothing ſhall ſtop him. He will not go with *Mahomet* to the Mountain, but will contrive ſome way or other to make the Mountain come to *Mahomet.* The Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance muſt be maintained; and he is

fully resolved it shall, rather than have his fine Scheme sink, for want of a Support. Here therefore he lays it down as *manifest, that in this Passage the* holy Martyr *had* Rom. 13. *in view*, and was teaching how far Christians were to suffer from the Higher Powers, and when they might and ought to resist them. And yet I dare say, let him ask any Man, not before intoxicated with his Notions, and he will readily tell him, that this is pure *Chimæra* and Imagination, and that there is not the shadow of a Reason for conceiving, that he had any regard to that Passage of S. *Paul* in this Discourse with the Proconsul. And I do not know what Mr. *H.* thinks of it, but I should be heartily ashamed to make him talk so improperly, as when the Proconsul calls him to *Swear and Renounce Christ*, instead of giving him a pertinent Answer, to go quite off from his Business, and read a Lecture to him concerning the Lawfulness of Resistance, and the Care that ought to be taken, for the Preservation of the Society he belonged to. This is such an Indignity put upon the Great and Good Man, as I hope Mr. *H.* when he has better considered it, will not persist in; and that his Admirers also will take notice, how little his Interpretations are to be depended upon, and upon what Dangers they run themselves by embracing them.

But Mr. *H.* lays a great Stress upon these Words, ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσφορον, *as is most proper or expedient*, and πῶς μὴ βλάψουσιν ἡμᾶς, *such as will not hurt us*. As if these must necessarily relate to our present Expedience and Safety; whereas I have shewn that they are spoken with respect to what is of infinitely greater Importance, and we are therefore abundantly more obliged to take care of, the eternal Salvation and Happiness of our Souls. And can any thing be more proper, more expedient, than above all things to provide for this? Or can any thing hurt us more, than what tends to our everlasting Destruction? The things of this World are not wholly unworthy of our Regard; but Mr. *H.* must own, those of the other call for it a thousand times more; and whatever endangers the Loss of them, hurts

us incomparably beyond all the Miseries and Calamities, the Cruelties and Tortures, the Pains and Deaths we can possibly undergo here. And it requires a great deal of Ingenuity, and I hope I may be pardoned if I say some Disingenuity too, to make all the unspeakable Concern the *Saint* had for these, to terminate in the Doctrine of *Resisting the Higher Powers*, contrary to the Laws both of God and Man.

So that upon the whole, Mr. *H.* could find amongst all the ancient Christian Writers, but two that he could any way fancy to patronize his Hypothesis; and how *manifestly* they have done it, I hope the Reader is sensible by this time; the one of them is against him, and the other is treating of another matter, and says not a word to the Point that he would have him.

Well, but if Mr. *H.* cannot prove that Two, or so much as one of them, will chime in with him, he is not yet discouraged, but like an undaunted Champion, will prove in the next place that their Universal Submission and Patience under the greatest and most undeserved and so most unjust Hardships, is no Evidence that they were not however convinced of the Lawfulness of Resistance. To this End he subjoins (*a*) these two Considerations.

1. *A particular Party of Men may be barbarously used in a Nation, and yet it may not be for the* Publick Good, *that they should defend themselves by entering into an open War against their Prince, and especially when it is the Opinion of the whole Body, except themselves, that the* Publick Happiness *would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than by their Preservation. This was the Case of the Primitive Christians*, &c. I doubt Mr. *H.* has not considered, that this directly condemns the *Camisars* in *France*, for resisting their Persecuting Prince; for it is plain they are but *a Party*, and comparatively a very small one; and *it is the Opinion of the whole Body, excepting themselves, that the* Publick Happiness *would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than by their Preservation*; and

(*a*) P. 146.

yet they have *entered into an open War against their Prince.* So that it is impossible for them to escape Mr. *H.*'s Censure. I cannot in Conscience be an Advocate for them; but yet I have this to say for myself, that neither I, nor any one else, need to condemn them more positively than Mr. *H.* does in this place. And this Condemnation of them he must own, till he shall think fit *to retract* what is here asserted. He condemns the *Rochellers* too for their Attempts formerly to vindicate themselves, against the Forces of their Sovereign. And he condemns the *Dutch* for rising against the King of *Spain*, and casting off his Yoke, whilst the whole Body of his Subjects, themselves excepted, were of *Opinion, the* Publick Happiness *would rather be promoted by their utter Destruction, than their Preservation.*

But that which I would offer as more material to our present purpose, is, that the Primitive Christians did not, that I can find any where, any of them, so much as once resolve their patient Submission and Non-resistance into their Regard for that Publick Good, Mr. *H.* is so over-fond of. They give another account of their quiet suffering all Indignities and Barbarities, namely that they did it out of Duty to Almighty God, and in hope of attaining to a better State by it, in another World. They would have despised such a Plea as this, and thought themselves highly dishonoured by it, as esteeming it beneath the Followers of the Blessed Jesus, to make any thing here in this World the End they aimed at in their Sufferings. They had an unconceivably nobler Prospect in view, that enflamed their Souls with an ardent Desire after it, as their greatest and chiefest Good, namely the eternal Enjoyment of God and their Blessed Saviour in the highest Heavens. And this it was, not any Hope of temporal Felicity, that carried them so resolutely and successfully through all their Conflicts, and *made them more than Conquerors through him that loved them.*

But still *they were a Party only*, and not the whole Body of the Empire. True, they were so; but a very numerous Party, as I have shewn from *Tertullian*, S. *Cyprian*,

prian, S. *Auguſtin*, from *Socrates*, and from *Pliny* too. And was it for the Good of the Empire that ſuch a large Body of Men ſhould be *deſtroyed rather than preſerved?* If it was not, their being only a Party was no juſt Ground for their Non-reſiſtance. If it was, it will be kindly done in Mr. *H.* to let us know, what Perſecution may not be juſtified at this rate. For no Prince perſecutes all his People together, but one Party only, though ſometimes the greater Party; and uſually the reſt of his Subjects, or at leaſt a conſiderable part of them are in Opinion with him, and againſt thoſe he perſecutes.

Wherefore ſeeing this Doctrine condemns ſuch as Rebels, whom I perſuade myſelf Mr. *H.* would not readily condemn as ſuch; ſince it gives a different Reaſon, for the quiet Sufferings of the Primitive Chriſtians, from what they give themſelves, and which they would never have deſired to be given for them; and ſince, *laſtly*, there was hardly ever any Perſecution but might be juſtified by it; I need ſay no more to prove the Weakneſs and Inſufficiency, and Unreaſonableneſs of it.

2. *It was very much for the Honour and Propagation of their Holy Religion, whilſt they were but a Party of Subjects, not concerned in the management of State-Affairs, that they ſhould engage the Love of the Princes of the World, and attract the Hearts of all Men to their Profeſſion, by their ſignal* Patience *and* Submiſſion, *to the greateſt Injuries and Torments imaginable; but it muſt be extremely to the Diſgrace and Hindrance of their Religion, if it obliged them, when they became the Majority, or the Whole of a Nation, and many of them neceſſarily concerned in the management of the Publick, to ſubmit themſelves to be ruined, and made miſerable at the Will of their Prince.* But can any greater Diſhonour be done to our moſt holy Religion, than thus to repreſent it as a Politick Engine, intended for the Service of temporal and ſecular Aims, teaching its Profeſſors meekly to ſubmit whilſt they are kept under; but that if ever they got ſtrength enough to rebell, they were bound in duty to do it, and muſt be ſure to op-

poſe and reſiſt their Sovereign with all their Might, rather than ſuffer unjuſtly by him? A Doctrine, much fitter for a *Matchiavel*, than a Preacher of the Goſpel of Peace, and Submiſſion, and Patience under undeſerved ill Uſage. And which, ſetting the Divine Providence aſide, as Mr. *H.* has done throughout his whole Scheme, if in ſome Conjunctures it ever prove uſeful in this World, yet it is much to be feared, will meet with but an uncomfortable Recompence in that which is to come.

Beſides, this is a Doctrine, that I preſume was to be kept as a great Secret, and not divulged upon any account, leſt ſo it ſhould unluckily defeat its own Deſign. For it is impoſſible to think of any more powerful Argument, to perſuade Princes to ſuppreſs and weaken the Chriſtians, and by all means imaginable prevent their ever getting into Power, than the letting them know that this Power would, upon all occaſions, be turned upon themſelves. Could any readier courſe be taken, to ſet all the Rulers in the World againſt them, than a diſcovery of theſe pernicious Principles, *hurtful to Kings and Princes*, and even to the Chriſtians themſelves, who inſtead of *attracting the Hearts of all Men to their Profeſſion*, would have hereby rendered it odious, and abominable, and ſet all honeſt Men againſt it, as tending to the Diſturbance of Mankind, and the Subverſion of all States and Kingdoms, that were ſo eaſy as to give it admittance amongſt them? And whether this would have been mightily for its Advantage, I ſhall not need to ſay. It follows, (*a*)

By the former, their quiet Submiſſion, *they demonſtrated to all the World the Power of their Faith, in caſes in which it was honourable for them to ſuffer, and to prefer the Publick Peace before their own private Intereſt.* And does it not then unavoidably follow, that their Faith would appear much more illuſtrious, by Suffering when it was in their power to prevent it, if they could have allowed themſelves to attempt ſo great a Wickedneſs? This would ſhew

(*a*) P. 147.

ſhew beyond all Contradiction, that they had a far greater Good in their eye, than the Peace and Welfare of Society, even the Joys of Heaven and a Bleſſed Eternity. Their Hopes would hereby evidently appear, to be ſet upon another Life. And every one that ſaw their meek and patient Suffering, when humanly ſpeaking they had it in their power to ſave themſelves, muſt confeſs they *had their Converſation* truly *in Heaven*, and undoubtedly preferred the Bliſs and Felicity of the other State, before all the Conveniences and Advantages of this; and that they certainly believed with S. *Ignatius*, That (*a*) *the nearer they drew to the end of their Conflict, the nearer they were to the perpetual Enjoyment of Almighty God*; and as *Cæcilius* ſpeaks in *Minutius Felix*, (*b*) the *Dread they had of everlaſting Death, ſet them above the Fear of any the worſt of Deaths, that could befall them here.* This was greatly for the Honour of their Religion; and made it manifeſt to all the World, that its Profeſſors were acted by greater Hopes and Expectations, and by a nobler Principle of Reliance upon God to take care of them, than the reſt of Mankind. And the more eaſily they could have promiſed themſelves, to ſhake off the Tyranny of their Perſecutors, ſo much the more glorioufly would their Submiſſion and Patience recommend them to the Beholders. And never therefore could this their Obedience appear, to ſuch ſingular Advantage, nor ſhew ſo plainly what mighty Influence their Faith had upon them, to ſet them above all the Terrors, or Allurements, of this World, as when Mr. *H.* ſays, *It would have been extremely to the Diſgrace and Hindrance of their Religion*, that is to ſay, *when they became the Majority, or the Whole of a Nation, and many of them neceſſarily concerned in the management of the Publick.* As I think all the World muſt allow, except Mr. *H.*

But he tells us farther, That *upon this Suppoſition nothing could be concluded, but that Chriſtianity was an Enemy to*

(*a*) Ἐγγὺς μαχαίρας, ἐγγὺς θεῦ· μεταξὺ θηρίων, μεταξὺ θεῦ. *B.* Ignat. *Ep. ad* Smyrn.

(*b*) Dum mori poſt mortem timent, interim mori non timent.

to the Publick Good *of Human Society; that it tended to conclude whole Nations under Tyranny and Slavery, and that it obliged Men to give up the Rights of an whole Society, and the Happineſs of the Generations to come.* Here Mr. *H.* ſpeaks like himſelf; I mean like one who, I am ſorry I am forced ſo oft to repeat it, ſhews no dependance upon Providence, nor dares believe the Scriptures, when they direct (*a*) to *caſt all our Care upon God*, with a Promiſe that if we do ſo, *he will be ſure to take care of us*; and again, That (*b*) *all things ſhall work together for good, to them that love God.* And yet he is as poſitive in what he affirms, as if it were true; though it is certain nothing in the World is leſs ſo. For ſomething elſe may unqueſtionably be concluded *upon this Suppoſition.* For it may be concluded, as I ſaid, that thoſe who acted in this manner, chiefly preferred the eternal Happineſs of the other State, of which they had ſo lively an impreſſion upon their Souls, that they could readily deſpiſe all things elſe, in compariſon of it. It might moreover be concluded, that that muſt neceſſarily be a truly noble, a divine and heavenly Religion, that could ſet Men ſo far above the World, and make them willingly endure all ſorts of Tortures and Cruelties, in obedience to its Precepts, and a firm belief of that ineſtimable *Recompence of Reward* it had ſet before them. And again it may be hence concluded, that Chriſtianity teaches to leave the management of this World, to God who made it, and knows beſt how to order all things in it, and that the Chriſtian's buſineſs is to ſerve God, and ſecure his own Eternal Welfare, and not make any temporal Good, whether his Own, or that of the Society he belongs to, the Rule to ſteer his courſe by. Theſe are plain and eaſy Conſequences from this Suppoſition; and that Mr. *H.* could not ſee them, ſhews only the Power of Prejudice, and too great an Attachment to his own Politicks, and his dearly beloved Doctrine of Reſiſtance.

Once more Mr. *H.* adds, *Something like this ſeems to have*

(*a*) 1 *S.* Pet. 5. 7. (*b*) Rom. 8. 28.

have been the Foundation of the Difference of the Behaviour of the Primitive Chriſtians *when they were but a Party, from their Behaviour, when they had by their* Patience, *and* Submiſſion, *gained ſo much ground as to become a* Majority, *and to be neceſſarily engaged in the management of* State-Affairs. *For after this we do not find that they thought themſelves obliged by their Religion to bear every thing with that* Quiet *and* Silent *Submiſſion they had before practiſed.* What Times or Places Mr. *H.* refers to here, he has not been pleaſed to inform us, and I am not willing to argue at random and by gueſs. Only I ſee he points ſtill at the *Primitive Chriſtians.* And whenever he will give himſelf the trouble to ſhew, that thoſe *Primitive Chriſtians* did at any time *think themſelves no longer obliged by their Religion, to bear every* thing quietly and ſubmiſſively as they had done before, I ſhall be ready to give him ſuch an Anſwer as I hope may convince him of his Miſtake. At preſent I deſire it may be remembred, that here is only his own bare Word for it, or rather not ſo much as that, but only a Declaration, That *he does not find they thought it.* Which is no Proof at all, that they did not both *think* and *practiſe* it.

I conclude therefore, that having ſhewn both the Doctrine and Practice of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, (*a*) whoſe univerſal Conſent is the beſt Expoſition of the holy Scriptures in this point, to be againſt all *Reſiſtance of the Higher Powers*, that they lived *by Faith and not by Senſe*, and would by no means venture the hazarding their eternal Salvation in the other World, for the preſervation, either of Themſelves, or the Community they belonged to in this; and having moreover particularly anſwered all Mr. *H.*'s Objections to the contrary, and ſhewn them to have nothing of Force or Solidity in them, I may very well reckon myſelf to have fully diſcharged my Undertaking in this reſpect; and that I

am

(*a*) Ἡμῶν δὲ ἡ πίστις ἐστὶν ἡ ὀρθὴ, καὶ ἐκ διδασκαλίας Ἀποστόλων ὁρμωμένη, καὶ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων βεβαιωθεῖσα, ἔκ τε νέας καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. B. Athanaſ. Ep. ad Adelph. c. Arian. p. 159.

am now at liberty to proceed to the Third thing I propounded; which was to consider the Doctrine of our own Church, and shew that this is exactly of the same Strain with that of the primitive and best Times of Christianity. This therefore I design for the Subject of the next Chapter.

CHAP. III.

What the Doctrine of our Church is in relation to this Duty of Non-resistance.

WHAT the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Christians were in relation to their Governors, how patient and submissive their Behaviour was, and how far they always were from ever attempting to resist those in Authority, though when powerfully tempted to it, I have already shewn somewhat largely, and come now to observe that our own Church's Doctrine in this point, is most exactly conformable to theirs. Not that it needs any long or elaborate Proof, it has been several Years since so fully made out, in the remarkable History of Passive Obedience. A Book wholly made up of Citations against Resistance, collected especially out of our own most celebrated Authors since the Reformation, together with some others, both of the Scots and Irish, and *Erasmus*, *Grotius*, *Casaubon*, *Bochart*, *Beza*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, and several other Foreigners, all concurring in the same Principle. Here are such a croud of Witnesses, and divers of them in the highest Stations, as are abundantly enough to outweigh all the Evidence Mr. *H.* can bring to the contrary. Such a Collection of such eminent Writers upon this subject, as most of them are, is a good Proof of that Church's Doctrine in this respect whereto they belonged. As whosoever will be at the pains of consulting the Book itself, may easily be satisfied.

fied. Thither therefore I refer the Reader; and ſhall content myſelf to make ſome few Additions of Paſſages, either omitted by that diligent Author, or elſe not publiſhed till after the compiling of that Collection, and then ſhall ſet down the Doctrine of the Homilies in this point, ſomewhat more fully and particularly than that Author hath done.

Biſhop *Andrews* on the Fifth Commandment ſpeaks thus: (*a*) " The Wickedneſs of the Perſon cannot take " away the Commandment, nor make God's Ordinance " void: *Rom.* 13. 1. All Power and Ordinance is from " God, ſo no Evil can make it void. Evil is twofold, " either which runneth to the *Puniſhment*, or to the " Fault. 1: For *Roughneß* or *Oppreſſion:* 1 *Pet.* 2. 18. " Obedience muſt be given to the Crooked and Fro- " ward, to ſuch as *Holofernes*, *Judith* 3. 8. ſuch as " nothing will pleaſe; Example, *Gen.* 16. 16. of *Sarah* " and *Agar*. Although *Sarah* dealt *roughly* with *Agar*, " yet the Angel willeth her to return to her Miſtreſs, " and *ſubmit* herſelf to her. And as in the *Family*, ſo " in the *Commonwealth*. It is known how *Saul* dealt " with *David:* yet *Pſal.* 120. *v.* laſt, he ſaith, *He* " *ſought peace with thoſe that loved not peace*; that is, ac- " knowledged *Submiſſion*, offering no violence neither " in the Cave, nor in the Bed. 2. For the other " *wicked Governors*, be they never ſo hard, it is plain " likewiſe, that to them *Obedience* and *Honour* is due. " For as it is true, *Hoſ.* 10. 3. that God *in ira*, in his " anger, *denieth* us a Prince: ſo alſo *Hoſ.* 13. 11. he " *giveth* a King in his wrath; expounded *Job* 34. 30. " that it is the Peoples fault, for their Sins. *Hoſ.* 8. 4. " It is his doing, becauſe the People would have it ſo. " —— Becauſe *Ephraim* will have Altars to ſin, *they* " *ſhall*, &c. In the New Teſtament, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. Pray- " ers for Governors, though no Chriſtians; 1 *Pet.* 2. 18. " Obey the King, *Nero:* and *Acts* 25. 11. *Appello Cæſa-* " *rem*, I appeal unto *Cæſar: Paul* uſeth the benefit of " his Government, refuſeth his *Deputy*, and appealeth " to

(*a*) P. 378, 379, 380.

" to *Nero himself*. Only this add out of S. *Chrysostom*; " ἀξίωμα ὃν ἐστὶ τῦ ἀνθρώπε, ἀλλὰ τ διατάξεως τῦ Θεῦ. The " Honour we give, is done, not to Man, but to God " himself. We reverence the Ordinance of God in " Men, not Man, so that Honour is due not πρωσώπῳ, " but προσωπείῳ, to the Vizard that God hath put " upon the Man's Person: more plain, *Esther* 6. 8. *Ha-* " *man* counselleth the King, Thus shall it be done, to " the Man whom the King would have honoured: he " shall put on a Robe of Estate, *&c.* And *Mordecai* " a base Man, was so honoured, and yet returned to " his private Estate. The Honour there, was done to " the King's Robes, and Crown, not to the private " Man. Thus we must conceive of evil Men; that " they are invested in the Lord's Robes and Crown; to " which we give Honour, not to the Man." Nothing can be plainer, than that this great Prelate teaches Obedience and Submission to the worst of Princes; not upon their own account, but because of the relation they stand in to Almighty God, as his Deputies and Ministers, and because of the Character and Authority they have received from him.

Before whom I should have mentioned the Martyr *Tyndale* in his (*a*) Notes on the thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans*, where he has this Observation, as pat to my purpose, as could be desired; which I shall here set down in his own Words and Spelling. **Thoughe thou were of powre to resiste the Magistrates, yet shoulde thy conscience condemne the, yf thou dyddeste it, because God commaundeth the, to do both good and euil at theyr commaundement: but to do the good thynges that they commaunde, and yf they commaunde the anie euil, to saye with Peter and John, it is oure parte rather to obeye God, then men. And yet lyfte no weapon agaynst them, but pacyently suffer at theyr handes whatsoeuer tyrannye they will execute vpon the, for not doynge theyr commaundements.** The

(*a*) *Printed* A. D. 1549.

The Protestants (God be thanked) says Dr. *Fulke*, (*a*) *at this day, as always, are obedient to wicked Princes, unto Death and Martyrdom.*

The Lord Bishop of *Sarum* in his *Second Part of the Enquiry into the Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, &c. speaking of the Times about the Second Council of *Nice*, expresses himself thus: (*b*) "We will not much dispute "concerning an Age, in which the World seemed mad "with a Zeal for the Worship of *Images*; and in which "*Rebellion*, and the Deposing of Princes upon the pre-"tence of Heresy, began to be put in practice: Such "Times as these, we willingly yield up to our Adver-"saries." Where his Lordship plainly condemns the Doctrine of Deposing Heretical Princes; and it will not be easy for Mr. *H.* to shew why Princes faulty in other respects are any more to be deposed than they. And before this, says his Lordship, (*c*) "We are not to con-"sider the Writings of some particular Persons, so much "as what hath been the generally received Opinion "among the Protestant Writers, and most taught in "their Pulpits and Schools. And whoever will at-"tempt the contradicting that this hath been for Abso-"lute Submission, it must be confessed to be hard to "determin, whether his IGNORANCE be most to be "pitied, or his CONFIDENCE most wondered at." What Answer Mr. *H.* will return his Lordship in this case, I will not pretend to guess. For my own part I only leave the Words with him and proceed. Mr. *Brown*, Rector of *Sligo* in *Ireland*, in his Sermon entituled *The Subjects Sorrow: Or Lamentations upon the Death of Britain's Josiah*, lately reprinted, speaks thus: (*d*) "A "King in his Kingdom is *solo Deo minor*, inferiour to "God only, says *Tertullian*, and then surely above his "People. *Deo subditus*, subject to God only, says "S. *Ambrose* unto *Valentinian*. *Princeps legibus solutus est*, "that the King is free from the Power of the Law, (is

"a

(*a*) *On* Rom. 13. 1.
(*b*) *Collection of eighteen Papers*, &c. p. 223.
(*c*) *First Conference*. p. 73. (*d*) P. 15.

" a Maxim as old as Christianity) that is, from the Pe-
" nalties of it. Laws have only a *directive*, not a *coer-*
" *cive* Power over him; though not as a mortal Man,
" yet in his politick consideration, he is above the Law.
" *Divino sunt judicio reservandi Reges*, Kings stand or
" fall unto their own Master, God; *satis est ad pœnam*
" *quod Deum habeant ultorem*, it is sufficient that God
" will punish their Crimes; He is the only Judge,
" not the People, unto whom our Appeal lies against
" the Injuries of their Proceedings.

Mr. *March* of *Newcastle* in his Sermon on *Judges* 19. 30. 1676-7. affirms, (*a*) " It was the Glory and Brag of the " Primitive Christians, that they could never be bran-
" ded for Traytors, or condemned for Rebels. Their
" Religion allowed them not to fight against their Prin-
" ces, but according to S. *Paul*'s Exhortation, they of-
" fered up their Prayers for the very worst of Tyrants.
" —— The (*b*) Papists alone had for many Ages the
" Monopoly of murdering Princes, of raising Rebel-
" lions under the colour of Religion, and Canonizing
" for Saints *Beckets*, *Garnets*, and the most prodigious
" Traytors: But that they have now any Pretence of
" discharging part of this Guilt upon Protestants them-
" selves, ought to be matter of Lamentation to us; and
" could we command all the Tears of a *Jeremy*, they
" would hardly suffice to wash away the Stain of this
" day's Guilt. But as we have too much cause to be-
" wail, that the Papists have got some Protestants
" amongst us to be *Fratres in malo*, Brethren in such hor-
" rid Wickednesses with themselves; so we must withal
" tell them, That the Church of *England* is no more
" concerned in this barbarous Fact, than any State is
" in the Crimes of those Malefactors, who suffer daily
" by the Sword of Justice." And in his Sermon on S. *Mat.* 7. 15, 16. (*c*) reckoning up dangerous Prin-ciples that had been industriously propagated, for carry-ing on the Rebellion against King *Charles* I. he instances, amongst others, in this: " That to disobey Princes,
" who

(*a*) P. 23. (*b*) P. 24. (*c*) P. 20.

" who submit their Scepters unto Christ's, is indeed " Rebellion; but to Resist, and take up Arms against " wicked Princes, is just, lawful, and warrantable: Whereupon he asks, " But how contrary is this both " to the Precepts and Examples of Christ and his A- " postles? We know, says he, Christ commands us to " lay down our Lives without the least Resistance, for " his and the Gospel's sake: And what our Saviour " taught by Precepts, he taught by Example too; for " he lived and died an obedient Subject unto *Cesar*, " patiently submitting himself to his wicked Gover- " nors. Has not S. *Paul* also told us plainly that they " who Resist shall receive to themselves Damnation, " and that we ought to be subject not only for Wrath, " but also for Conscience sake? And when did S. *Paul* " preach such Doctrines as these, but when such Mon- " sters of Wickedness, as *Caligula*, *Claudius*, and *Nero* " swayed the Scepters of the World?

Dr. *Calamy* (*a*) affirms " *There is nothing more evi-* " *dent* than that this Principle, that it is lawful in " some cases for Subjects by force to resist their King, " and Sovereign, doth open a wide Door to all manner " of Disorder and Confusion. For if ever it be lawful " for Subjects to resist the Sovereign Power, then it fol- " lows that Subjects have always a right to judge, whe- " ther their present Case be such, as that they may " lawfully resist in; and if they be Judges, this Propo- " sition that Subjects may resist in some cases, of which " themselves are Judges, is the same as to say, that " they may do it whenever they shall think fit for to " do it; and thus any Suspicion or Discontent taken " up against the Government, any Grievance we may " fancy, any thing our Governor doth that is miscon- " strued or misinterpreted, will be thought a justifiable " Pretence for taking up Arms against him, which ne- " cessarily lays the Foundation of everlasting Wars and " Troubles. I might therefore sufficiently evince the " falseness of this Principle, from the inevitable mis-

(*a*) *Artillery-Sermon.* p. 6, 7.

" chievous Conſequences of it; but it rather becomes " the place I now ſtand in to ſhew how wicked and " unchriſtian a Doctrine it is. And there is nothing " more plainly and ſolemnly condemned by the Laws " of our Religion, than for Subjects by force of Arms " on any occaſion to reſiſt the Supreme Power and " Authority, let it be in one ſingle Perſon, or more, " according to the different Forms of Government in " ſeveral Countries. Or to ſpeak as the caſe is amongſt " our ſelves, it is never lawful by our Religion on any " Pretence to reſiſt the King, or any authoriſed by the " King, whom we all acknowledge in the Oath of *Su-* " *premacy* to be *the only Supreme Governor of this Realm*, " and if he be *the only Supreme*, there is no Power on " Earth equal or coordinate to his, any more than " there is a Superiour.

Dr. *Meriton* in a Sermon preached at S. *Martyn's in the Fields*, and dedicated to the Earls of *Northumberland*, *Salisbury*, *Mulgrave*, the Lord *Seymour* and others, profeſſes of *David*, That (*a*) " He thought a Kingdom dear " bought with contracting the Guilt of Royal Blood " upon him, and reſolves better, *Deſtroy him not, for* " *who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed* " *and be guiltleſs?* ——— They [*Kings*] muſt, it is " true, be accountable to him, [*the King of Kings*] but " upon Earth their ſacred Perſons cannot be judged " and ſentenced by their Peers.

" *I do find and feel*, ſays Mr. *Edward Symmons*, (*b*) that " God's Word tyes my Conſcience to obey every one of " the King's Commands, (that are not againſt Piety) " yea his Perſonal, as well as his Legal, and thoſe firſt " in caſe of difference; nor do I (for my part) obey " the King's Law, becauſe it is eſtabliſhed, or becauſe " of its known Penalty annexed, nor yet the King him- " ſelf becauſe he rules according to his Law; theſe are " not my Grounds of Obedience; but I obey the King's " Law, becauſe I obey the King; and I obey the King, " becauſe I obey God; I obey the King and his Law,

" becauſe

(*a*) P. 27. (*b*) *Loyal Subjects Belief.* p. 27.

" becauſe of God and his Law, which I hold to be the " beſt Obedience, and that of a Chriſtian Man.

Mr. *Long* of *Exeter* in a Thankſgiving Sermon preached *July* 26. 1685. argues thus. (*a*) " If any Cauſe " could juſtify *Reſiſtance* againſt a lawful Power, that " of *David* againſt *Saul* might be warranted, *Saul* be- " ing *rejected* of God as a bloody Man, and having firſt " *deſpiſed his Commandment*; *and David a man after God's* " *own heart*, Choſen and Anointed to ſucceed him; " yet neither the *Wickedneſs* of *Saul*, nor the *Holy Unction* " of *David*, was thought a ſufficient Cauſe *to lift up* " *Hands againſt him*, though *Saul* had perſecuted him " with ſo much Malice, and ſo unceſſantly ſought his " Deſtruction, that he concluded he ſhould *one day pe-* " *riſh by the hand of Saul*; and God had more than once " delivered *Saul* up into *David*'s Hands, ſo that he " might have pleaded Providence; and he was provo- " ked to *take away Saul*'s Life, *for the preſervation of his* " *own*; and when, to let *Saul* know that he had an " opportunity to take away his Life, he *cut off the skirt* " *of his garment*, *David's heart ſmote him* for it, and to " his Perſon the *Holy Unction* of *Saul* was a *Nolime tan-* " *gere*; *for who*, ſays he, *can lift up his hand againſt the* " *Lord's anointed*, and be guiltleſs? ——— (*b*) As " there is no preceding Cauſe can juſtify *Reſiſtance of* " *lawful Princes*; ſo neither any Deſign or ſubſequent " Effect; *No man may do evil that good may come of it.*

So alſo ſays Dr. *Thompſon* Dean of *Briſtol*, in a Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church there, *June* 21. 1685. (*c*) " Subjects are *not only* to obey them that " are *Religious*, and whom *they* acknowledge to be " *Chriſtian*; but even thoſe who are of a *contrary* Re- " ligion, and when they *perſecute* and *oppoſe* theirs. " Subjects muſt *ſubmit* to *thoſe* Princes, if they be *theirs*. " For they are ſtill *the Ordinances of God*, whatever elſe " they be. ——— Since *Chriſt's* Kingdom is of *another* " nature, his Soldiers are *not* to *fight* againſt their *Tem-* " *poral* Governor even in *Defenſe* of Chriſt himſelf.

 " There

(*a*) P. 5. (*b*) P. 6. (*c*) P. 13.

" There is nothing so *Unchristian*, (*a*) nothing so *Un-*
" *reasonable*, as for Subjects to *seek* Occasions to *dispute*
" the *Wills* and *Pleasures* of their *Princes*; and how
" much more, to raise *Tumults*, and levy *Arms* against
" them? Yea though they were *Heathens* and *Tyrants*,
" and the *most professed Enemies that can be imagined* to
" *God* and *Goodness*.

Mr. *Graile* of *Norfolk* in his Third Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of *Norwich* (*b*) speaks thus. " *What if it should be granted* that the cause of Mens " Fears and Jealousies concerning the future State of a " Kingdom, is true and real? The worst that any good " Man can fear, from any lawful Sovereign whatso-" ever, is suffering under him; but it is far better to " suffer wrong than to do it. And when Suffering can-" not be avoided, (as in this World it sometimes cannot) " 'tis far more tolerable to suffer under the severest Go-" vernment of one rightful Prince, than under the il-" legal Tyranny of numerous Invaders, who assume " the greatest and most unbounded Power, without the " least right to any Authority.

How earnestly the learned Bishop *Beveridge* presses this Duty in his *Private Thoughts upon Religion*, declaring that " The Wrath of God shall as certainly fall upon " those that rise up against the King, as upon those that " fight against God; that it is not the *Holiness*, but the " *Authority of God* that the Prince represents, and that " *the most wicked*, as well as *the most holy* Person may be " *endowed with, &c.*" I have (*c*) already observed, and shall not here repeat it; but shall only note what I meet with to this purpose in (*d*) a Sermon of his on 1 S. *Pet.* 2. 13. " *By every Ordinance of Man* he means " all, and every one that is entrusted with the Govern-" ment of the Place or Country where we live. *First*, " the King, or supreme Magistrate, who receives his " Commission immediately from *God* himself, and " therefore is accountable to none but him for the " execution

(*a*) P. 19, 20. (*b*) P. 119, 120. (*c*) Part. 1. p. 71, 72, 73.
(*d*) Vol. 10. Sermon XIII. p. 404, 405, 406.

" execution of it, as the Apoſtle here plainly intimates, " in that he calls him *the Supreme*; for if he be Supreme, " then all other Perſons in his Kingdoms are inferiour " to him, both ſingly and jointly: So that neither any " one, nor all together, can juſtly pretend to any Power " over him, becauſe they are all under him; otherwiſe " he would not be the Supreme, as the Apoſtle here " calls him. Neither is this Duty to be performed on- " ly to the King himſelf, but as the Apoſtle adds, to " *Governors* alſo, as to thoſe who are *ſent by him*, that " is, who are commiſſioned by the King ——— But " here we may obſerve farther, that this Command was " laid upon all Chriſtians, when there was never a " Chriſtian King or Governor in the World, but were " all rather inveterate Enemies to Chriſtianity itſelf, " and endeavoured all they could to deſtroy and baniſh " it out of the World, yet for all that, all Chriſtians " are here commanded to ſubmit to them. Which " ſhews that the Duty is to be performed to the King, " as ſuch: Not becauſe he is a Chriſtian, a juſt, a " merciful King, but becauſe he is a King authorized " by God to rule and govern us.

" This, ſays (*a*) Dr. *Kennet* Dean of *Peterburgh*, is " the true foundation of that common Axiom, *the King* " *can do no wrong*, becauſe there is no Right and Re- " medy againſt his Royal Perſon." Mr. Dean alſo informs us farther, (*b*) " That the Statute, 12. *Char.* II. " *chap.* 30. 7. which utterly condemns all Pretence to " a coercive Power over our Sovereign, was no inno- " vation, but was declarative of our ORIGINAL " CONSTITUTION.

But I know none has urged this Duty more home, or guarded more carefully againſt all Evaſions, or whatſoever Pretences for the breach of it, than Dr. *Manningham* the preſent Lord Biſhop of *Chicheſter*. Who in (*c*) a Sermon preached at the *Rolls*, *Jan.* 30 and licen-

(*a*) *In the Margin of his Sermon preached before the Houſe of Commons*, Jan. 30. 1705-6.
(*b*) Ibid. (*c*) P. 20, 21.

fed *Feb.* 8. 1685-6. aſſures his Auditory, " That the " Unlawfulneſs of RESISTANCE IN ANY CASE, " AND UPON ANY PRETENCE WHATSO- " EVER, either *Popiſh* or *Fanatick*, has been ſo ſtrong- " ly aſſerted, and ſo fully ~~Evidenced~~ Vindicated through all the " Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament, through " the Hiſtories, Examples, Apologies of the Primitive " Times, by unanſwerable poſitive Reaſons, by a re- " moval of all imaginable Objections, and by the " Convictions of former and late Experience, that no " Man can for the future be a Rebel in this Nation, " without being either a HYPOCRITE or an " ATHEIST. Thus, ſays his Lordſhip, you ſee with " what Conſcience, Learning, Induſtry, and Perſua- " ſion, the *Church* of *England* has endeavoured to diſpel " all the Miſts of former Darkneſs, to take away all " Materials for Sedition, and to make all her Members " Religious, Wiſe and Peaceable.

" There had been, ſays the Lord Biſhop of *Exon*, " (*a*) long before S. *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Ro-* " *mans*, —— many cruel Tyrants, and Monſters of " Men, in poſſeſſion of the Higheſt Power; there had " been one ——— before, and yet not very long be- " fore that time, of whom the *Hiſtorian* relates this " Paſſage, That he wiſh'd all the Citizens of *Rome* had " but one Neck, that he might diſpatch 'em all at " one blow; and yet not one Word do we meet with " in S. *Paul*, or any other *Apoſtle*, ſerving to inſtruct " Subjects in the Natural Right, that they had in ſuch " Caſes, to defend themſelves by Reſiſtance; much leſs " to Depoſe, Judge, Puniſh, —— or to *Neck*, or Be- " head their Sovereign: Nothing but *let every ſoul be* " *ſubject to the Higher Powers*; *ye muſt needs be ſubject*, " *not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake*, &c.

" I am ſtrongly inclined, ſays the ingenious and lear- " ned Dr. *Moſs*, to think (*b*) that if that known Paſſage, " in the thirteenth to the *Romans*, had been ſuffered to " ſtand

(*a*) *Anſwer to Mr.* Hoadly's *Letter.* p. 29.
(*b*) *Sermon before the Houſe of Commons*, Jan. 30. 1706.

" ſtand by itſelf, unincumbered with all ſtrange Gloſ-
" ſes; and had it been only conſidered when, and to
" whom the Injunction was given, and in what ſolemn
" manner, no Mortal could ever have dreamt that it
" ſhould ever infer any Licence, much leſs imply an
" Obligation of Reſiſting the Supreme Magiſtrate,
" with Violence and Outrage, and Perſecuting him
" even to the Death. One would think too, if that
" Text did ſtand in any need of Explication, that the
" univerſal Practice of the Primitive Chriſtians, the
" conſtant Judgment of the ancient Fathers, the expreſs
" Doctrine of our received Homilies, and the Conſent
" of all the beſt and moſt learned Interpreters, ſhould
" be more likely to lead into the true Meaning of it,
" than the perverſe Comments of a *Mariana*, or a *Dole-*
" *man*, or any other Paraſite, or Aſſerter of his exter-
" minating Power over Princes; I add, or a *Junius*
" *Brutus*, a *Knox*, or *Buchanan*, or any *Sheba* blowing
" a Trumpet of Rebellion in our Land.

Dr. *Sacheverel* in his well known (*a*) Sermon, about *Perils from falſe Brethren*, ſpeaks thus. " The Grand
" Security of our Government, and the very Pillar upon
" which it ſtands, is founded upon the ſteady Belief of
" the Subjects Obligation to an abſolute and uncon-
" ditional Obedience to the Supreme Power, in all
" things Lawful, and the utter *Illegality* of *Reſiſtance*
" upon any Pretence whatſoever.

Mr. *Milbourn* juſtly (*b*) terms theſe *Antiſcriptural* Doctrines; " That *the Original of all Power is from the*
" *People; that lawful Princes are accountable to, and puniſh-*
" *able and depoſable by their own Subjects; that if the Prince*
" *fails in his Duty, the Subjects are immediately diſcharged*
" *from theirs*, &c." And ſpeaking of S. *Paul*'s Appeal from *Feſtus* to *Nero*, draws this Inference from it; (*c*) " This Action of S. *Paul* may ſerve to explain his
" Meaning when he commands, *Rom.* 13. 1. *Every ſoul*

(*a*) *Preached at S.* Paul's Nov. 5. 1709.
(*b*) *Sermon on* Jan. 30. 1708.
(*c*) Melius inquirendum. *p.* 13.

" *to be Subject to the Higher Powers*; which he does, not " becauſe they were good or bad Men, juſt or unjuſt " in diſcharging their Duties, but *becauſe they were or-* " *dained of God.* He, who had made *David*, *a Man after* " *God's own Heart*, King of all *Iſrael*, made *Jeroboam*, " *the Man that taught* Iſrael *to ſin*, King over the re- " volted Tribes. He, who made *Joſiah* King of *Judah*, " had made his Father *Amon* ſo before him. He, who " anointed *Cyrus* King of *Perſia*, made the barbarous " *Cambyſes* his Succeſſor. He, who made *Auguſtus*, " *Veſpaſian*, *Trajan*, the *Antonines*, *Alexander Severus*, " *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius* firſt and ſecond, Emperors of " *Rome*; raiſed *Caligula*, *Nero*, *Domitian*, *Commodus*, " *Maximin*, *Diocleſian*, *Julian*, *Phocas*, Monſters of " Men, to the ſame Dignity. And indeed, let thoſe " who are our *lawful* and *rightful Governors*, be good or " bad, as to their perſonal Qualifications, *they are not* " *Terrours to good Works*, *but to the evil*; for *who can* " *harm us*, *if we be doers of that which is good?* is S. *Peter*'s " Queſtion. But the worſt of Princes will be ſtill a " Terrour to evil-doers. For tho' ſome vicious Perſons " may be Favourites to a lawful Prince, who governs " tyrannically; yet there never was ſuch a Tyrant in " the World, who did not, by his Laws, and by the " Miniſtry of his Subſtitutes, bring abundance of real " *Malefactors to condign Puniſhment*; and their very *Fa-* " *vourites*, tho' in the Boſoms of their Maſters, are in " as dangerous a condition, as the worſt of Men are " under *the beſt of Governors.* How, therefore, we " ought to behave ourſelves under the worſt of Gover- " nors, S. *Paul* teaches us by his own Example; for he, " under the immediate Conduct of the Holy Spirit, " appeal'd to *Nero Cæſar*, as wicked as he was, which " he would never have done, had it not been juſt and " agreeable to the Will of God." Again, (*a*) " The " *Sovereign*, or *Supreme Power* in all Governments, muſt " be Abſolute, Arbitrary, above all Coercion; other- " wiſe, no inconvenient, no unjuſt Laws, can ever be " amended

(*a*) P. 18.

" amended or repealed." And particularly as to our Conſtitution he obſerves, " That (*a*) our *written Laws* " declare *the Kingdom of* England *a Monarchy*, *an* " *Empire*; the *Crown of* England *independent*, *imperial*, " *and from God only.* They declare that there is no " Power coordinate with, nor coercive over him; and " that every Attempt to *coerce him*, to *raiſe Arms* " againſt him, to *Diſinherit him*, is *High Treaſon*, &c." (*b*) " It has been long thought, by very good Men, " that this Chapter [*Rom.* 13.] teaches us, that *all law-* " *ful Magiſtrates are the Ordinance of God, and that they* " *have their Commiſſion from Him*; and it looks very like " Truth, and ſuch Truth as even the Heathen World, " by their weaker Light, had diſcovered, tho' an " Apoſtle, inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt had not aſſerted " it. But when S. *Paul* tells us, in as expreſs Words as " poſſible, That *the Powers that be, are ordained of God*; " *and that they who Reſiſt them, Reſiſt the Ordinance of God*; " *and as a Reward for their Reſiſtance, ſhall receive to* " *themſelves Damnation*; one would have thought that " Doctrine ſhould have been rendred Authentick, at " leaſt among Chriſtians." And a little after; " If " the Chriſtians *were Doers of Good*, (*c*) were the Empe- " rors *Terrours to good Works*, or *to the Evil*, when they " perſecuted the Chriſtians, ſince *they did it as Ma-* " *giſtrates in the Execution of their Office*, and according " to the known Laws of the Empire? Yet *theſe very* " *Chriſtians*, were the Perſons whom the Apoſtle com- " manded *to be ſubject to the Higher Powers*, and aſſures " them that *if they Reſiſted theſe Powers, they Reſiſted the* " *Ordinance of God, and ſhould receive to themſelves Dam-* " *nation.*" With a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe, both in that ſame Sermon, and his other ſince entituled *The Impiety and Folly of Reſiſting Lawful Governors by Force or Arms.*

" I confeſs, (*d*) ſays Dr. *Welton*, I much wonder, not " from what Aſſurance, but from what Pretence or " Colour,

(*a*) P. 19. (*b*) *Meaſures of Reſiſtance.* p. 3.
(*c*) P. 9.
(*d*) *Sermon before the Lieutenancy of* London, Nov. 19. 1710.

" Colour, these Gentlemen of Latitude can attempt to
" evade, and act in open Defiance to all those Threats,
" Commands, and Obligations, that are so expres's in
" the thirteenth Chapter to the *Romans:* 'Tis a plain
" case, that however they may endeavour to wrest the
" Precepts laid down there to their own pernicious and
" destructive Purposes, the truth of the matter is, they
" must have renounced the Notions of a God, a Con-
" science, and a future State; they must have exchang'd
" the Everlasting Truths of Religion and Order, for
" those dear purchas'd Contradictions of Anarchy and
" Democracy, over-balancing Right and Justice only
" with the weight of some sordid Interest, some *filthy*
" *Lucre*; else they could never be thus led by Principle,
" as they are, to Insult their Prince, Blaspheme Autho-
" rity, Defy Religion, and Trample upon all Right
" and Duty. Can any positive Command in nature
" be more plain, than that which is so literally en-
" joined by these Words? *Let every Soul be subject to*
" *the Higher Powers; the Powers that be, are ordained of*
" *God:* Therefore *we must needs be subject for Conscience*
" *sake: For they that Resist, shall receive to themselves*
" *Damnation.* ——— (*a*) Where the Commands of
" Princes are lawful, we are bound by our Principles
" to an Active Obedience. This admits of no Scruple,
" or Debate; *Ye must needs be subject, not only for Wrath,*
" *but also for Conscience sake:* This engages us upon all
" Occasions to submit our private Judgment to Publick
" Authority, where it is not evident from the Word of
" God, that it's contrary to our Duty; and in all
" things to stand by and defend their sacred Characters
" and Persons, from the Insolencies and Attempts of
" those that dare to oppose them. And where their
" Commands are really unlawful, we must submit and
" yield a Passive Obedience unto them; we must not
" otherwise *withstand* them, than by our Prayers and
" Tears, and so far we may be said to *withstand*, and
" no farther. ——— (*b*) We know, and do believe
that

(*a*) P. 9. (*b*) P. 10.

" that *there is no rising up against the King*, Prov. 30. 31.
" There is no Power given or allow'd from God unto
" the People, to Coerce, or to Try or Judge their
" Prince, but to keep his Command, and to observe
" his Pleasure in things lawful, and to undergo Penal-
" ty where they are not so.

The Lord Bishop of *Bristol* speaking of *David*, (*a*) has this Observation concerning him. " He could not " but know that his EXEMPTION FROM ANY " EARTHLY COERCION, by leaving him so much " in the Counsel of his own Will, exposed him to the " Danger of being led into Errour and Mistakes." Where his Lordship evidently takes it for granted, as an undoubted Truth, that King *David* was, and by consequence all Sovereign Princes are, *exempt from all earthly Coercion*.

To the same purpose speaks Mr. *Blomer*. (*b*) " The " Supreme Magistrate, if he will act justly and reaso-" nably, must govern according to Law; for he has " solemnly Sworn to do so. If, in spite of all Obli-" gations, he will take upon him to act arbitrarily and " illegally, and to oppress and enslave the People com-" mitted to his Charge; his Person indeed is Sacred, " for he is the Lord's Anointed; *And who may say unto* " *Him*, What dost Thou?

But I shall not stand to heap up particular Instances of this nature, though the Sermons and other Writings of the *English* Clergy afford good store of them; but leaving the several Members, shall proceed to the Church itself, to shew that her own avowed Doctrine as taught in the Book of Homilies, set forth by Authority, and appointed to be read in Churches, is so full and express in favour of the Doctrine of Non-resistance, that nothing can be more so; and this not only by the by, and in some casual or accidental Passage, that perhaps might be streined beyond the Design of the Compilers, but studiously and industriously, as the Aim and End of

(*a*) *Sermon at S.* James's, March 8. 1710.
(*b*) *Sermon in King* Henry VII's *Chappel*, March 8. 1710.

of the Discourse, and which is in no wise to be avoided, but by Mr. *H.*'s way of interpreting, that is, by putting a contrary Sence to what was intended, upon the Words, and which they can by no means bear.

Here therefore it is the undoubted Doctrine of our Church, That (*a*) We must refer all Judgment to GOD, to Kings and Rulers, Judges under them, which be GOD's Officers to execute Justice, and by plain Words of Scripture, have their Authority, and use of the Sword granted from GOD, as we are taught by S. Paul, that dear and chosen Apostle of our Saviour Christ, whom we ought diligently to obey, even as we would obey our Saviour Christ, if he were present. Thus S. Paul writeth to the Romans, Let every soul submit himself unto the authority of the Higher Powers, for there is no power but of GOD. The powers that be are ordained of GOD. Whosoever therefore withstandeth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of GOD; but they that resist, or are against it, shall receive to themselves Damnation. For Rulers are not fearful to them that do good, but to them that do evil. Wilt thou then be without fear of that Power? Do well then, so shalt thou be praised for the same, for he is the Minister of GOD for thy wealth. But, and if thou do that which is evil, then fear, for he beareth not the Sword for nought, for he is the Minister of GOD, to take vengeance on him that doth evil. Wherefore ye must needs obey, not only for fear of vengeance, but also, because of conscience, and even for this cause pay you tribute, for they are GOD's Ministers serving for the same purpose. Here let us learn of S. Paul, the chosen vessel of GOD, that all persons having souls (he excepted none, nor exempteth none, neither Priest, Apostle, nor Prophet, saith S. Chrysostom) do owe of bounden duty, and even in conscience, obedience, submission, and subjection, to the High Powers, which be set in authority by GOD, for-al-

(*a*) *First part of the Sermon of Obedience*, p. 71.

forasmuch as they be GOD's Lieutenants, GOD's Officers, GOD's Commissioners, GOD's Judges, ordained of GOD himself, of whom only they have all their power, and all their authority. And the same S. Paul threateneth no less pain, than everlasting Damnation to all disobedient persons, to all resisters against this general, and common authority, forasmuch as they resist not man but GOD; nor man's device, and invention, but GOD's Wisdom, GOD's Order, Power, and Authority. ——— (a) And here, (good people) let us all mark diligently, that it is not lawful for inferiours, and subjects, in any case to resist, and stand against the superiour Powers; for S. Paul's words be plain, that whosoever withstandeth, withstandeth the ordinance of GOD. Our Saviour Christ himself, and his Apostles, received many, and divers injuries of the unfaithful, and wicked men in authority; yet we never read that they, or any of them, caused any sedition, or rebellion against authority. —— They knew that the authority of the Powers was GOD's ordinance, and therefore both in their words, and deeds, they taught ever obedience to it, and never taught nor did the contrary. The wicked Judge Pilate said to Christ, Knowest thou not, that I have power to crucify thee, and have power also to loose thee? Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above. Whereby Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked Rulers have their power, and authority from GOD, and therefore it is not lawful for their subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their power. — The holy Apostle Peter commandeth servants to be obedient to their Masters, not only if they be good, and gentle, but also if they be evil, and froward; affirming that the vocation, and calling of GOD's people, is to be patient, and of the suffering sides. And there he bringeth in the patience of our Saviour Christ,

(a) *Second part of the same Sermon.* p. 72.

Christ, to persuade obedience to Governors, yea, although they be wicked, and wrong doers. ——— (a) Holy David also teaches us a good lesson in this behalf, who was many times most cruelly, and wrongfully persecuted by King Saul, and many times also put in jeopardy, and danger of his life by King Saul, and his people, yet he neither withstood, nor used any force or violence against King Saul, his mortal and deadly enemy, but did ever to his liege lord, and master, King Saul, most true, most diligent, and most faithful service, with more to the same purpose. Whereupon it follows; Here is evidently proved, that we may not withstand, nor in anywise hurt an anointed King, which is GOD's Lieutenant, Vicegerent, and highest Minister in that country where he is King. But peradventure some here would say, that David here in his own defence might have killed King Saul lawfully, and with a safe conscience: But holy David did know that he might in no wise withstand, hurt, or kill his sovereign Lord and King: he did know he was but King Saul's subject, though he were in great favour with GOD, and his enemy King Saul out of GOD's favour. Therefore though he were never so much provoked, yet he refuseth utterly to hurt the Lord's anointed. He durst not for offending GOD, and his own conscience, (although he had occasion and opportunity) once lay his hands upon GOD's high Officer, the King, whom he did know to be a person reserved, and kept (for his Office sake) only to GOD's punishment and judgment. ——— (b) By these two Examples S. David (being named in Scripture a man after GOD's own heart) giveth a general rule and lesson to all subjects in the world, not to withstand their liege Lord, and King, not to take a sword by their private authority against their King, GOD's anointed, who only beareth the sword by GOD's authority for the maintenance of the good, and for the punishment of the evil; who only by GOD's Law

(a) P. 73. (b) P. 74.

Law hath the use of the sword at his command, and also hath all power, jurisdiction, regiment, correction, and punishment, as supreme Governor of all his Realms and Dominions, and that even by the authority of GOD, and by GOD's Ordinances. Then follows an account of the *Amalekite*, who had killed *Saul*, and the unexpected return he met with from *David* for it. Whence again it is inferred, That it is an intolerable ignorance, madness, and wickedness, for subjects to make any murmuring, rebellion, resistance, or withstanding, commotion, or insurrection against their most dear, and most dread sovereign Lord, and King, ordained, and appointed of GOD's goodness for their commodity, peace, and quietness. Yet let us believe —— that we may not obey Kings, Magistrates, or any other —— if they would command us to do any thing contrary to GOD's Commandments. —— But nevertheless in that case we may not in any wise withstand violently, or rebell against Rulers, or make any insurrection, sedition, or tumults, either by force of arms or otherwise against the anointed of the Lord, or any of his officers; but we must in such case patiently suffer all wrongs, and injuries, referring the judgment of our cause only to GOD. —— (*a*) The violence and injury that is committed against authority, is committed against GOD, the Commonweal, and the whole Realm; which God will have known, and condignly and worthily punished one way or other. —— Therefore let us all fear the most detestable vice of rebellion, ever knowing, and remembring, that he that resisteth or withstandeth common authority, resisteth, or withstandeth GOD, and his Ordinance, as it may be proved by many other more places of Scripture. —— (*b*) This is GOD's Ordinance, GOD's Commandment, and GOD's Holy Will, that the whole body of every Realm, and all the members, and

(*a*) *Last part of the same Sermon.* p. 75.
(*b*) P. 77.

and parts of the same, shall be subject to their Head, their King, and that (as S. Peter writeth) for the Lord's sake: and (as S. Paul writeth) for conscience sake, and not for fear only.

Thus plain and peremptory is this Homily against all Resistance of our lawful Superiours, whether faithful and upright in the discharge of their Office, or such as grosly neglect and contradict the End and Design of it. It teaches that Kings have their Authority from God, and are his Lieutenants, Vicegerents, Commissioners, and Judges; that the Sword belongs to them alone, as committed to them by God; that to Resist them, is to Resist not Man but God, not Man's Invention, but God's Wisdom, God's Order, Power, and Authority; that it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects in any case to resist and stand against the superiour Powers; that even wicked Rulers have their Power and Authority from God, and it is not lawful for their Subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their Power; and though they command any thing unlawful, though they are not to be obeyed herein, yet nevertheless in that case, we may not in any wise withstand Violently, or Rebell against such Rulers, or make any Insurrection, or Tumults, but must patiently suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the Judgment of our Cause to God only. This is the Sum of what I have cited out of this *Homily of Obedience*; and it so plainly and positively condemns all violent and forcible Opposition to the *Higher Powers*, that Mr. *H.* must have very good luck, if he can make all this be spoken in favour of Resistance.

And again this same Church of ours teaches (*a*) That in reading of the Holy Scriptures, we shall find in very many, and almost infinite places, as well of the Old Testament, as of the New, that Kings and Princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by GOD's Ordinance, and that Subjects are bound to obey

(*a*) *Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*, p. 276.

obey them. And then (*a*) it argues from *Rom.* 13. and 1 *S. Pet.* 2. repeating what is there taught as to this point, by the two great Apostles S. *Paul* and S. *Peter*. Then it follows, It is most evident that —— such Subjects as are disobedient or rebellious against their Princes, disobey GOD, and procure their own damnation; and that if Servants ought to obey their Masters, not only being gentle, but such as be froward; as well and much more ought Subjects to be obedient, not only to their good, and courteous, but also to their sharp, and rigorous Princes. —— (*b*) What shall Subjects do then? shall they obey valiant, stout, wise, and good Princes, and condemn, disobey, and rebell against children being their Princes, or against undiscreet, and evil Governors? God forbid: For first what a perillous thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the judgment, which Prince is wise, and godly, and his government good, and which is otherwise? as though the foot must judge of the head, an enterprise very heinous, and must needs breed rebellion. For who else be they that are most inclined to rebellion, but such haughty spirits? From whom springeth such foul ruin of Realms? Is not Rebellion the greatest of all mischiefs? And who are most ready to the greatest mischiefs, but the worst men? Rebels therefore the worst of all Subjects, are most ready to rebellion, as being the worst of all vices, and farthest from the duty of a good Subject. —— What an unworthy matter were it then, to make the naughtiest Subjects, and most enclining to rebellion, and all evil, judges over their Princes, &c. —— Whereas indeed a Rebel is worse than the worst Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst government of the worst Prince that hitherto hath been: both Rebels are unmeet ministers, and Rebellion an unfit, and unwholsom medicine to reform any small lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little

(*a*) P. 277. (*b*) P. 279.

griefs in government, such lewd remedies being far worse than any other maladies and disorders, that can be in the body of a Commonwealth. But whatsoever the Prince be, or his Government, it is evident that for the most part, those Princes, whom some Subjects do think to be very godly, and under whose government they rejoice to live; some other Subjects do take the same to be evil, and ungodly, and do wish for a change. If therefore all Subjects that mislike of their Prince, should rebell, no Realm should ever be without rebellion. ——— (a) But what if the Prince be undiscreet, and evil indeed, and is also evident to all mens eyes that he is so? I ask again, What if it be long of the wickedness of the Subjects that the Prince is undiscreet and evil? shall the Subjects both by their wickedness provoke GOD for their deserved punishment, to give them an undiscreet, or evil Prince, and also rebell against him, and withall against GOD, who for the punishment of their sins did give them such a Prince? &c. —— Here you see GOD placeth as well evil Princes as good, and for what cause he doth both. ——— For Subjects to deserve through their sins to have an evil Prince, and then to rebell against him, were double, and treble evil, by provoking GOD more to plague them. — Who, I pray you, was Prince over the most part of the Christians, when GOD's Holy Spirit by S. Paul gave them this lesson? Forsooth Caligula, Claudius, or Nero; who were not only no Christians, but Pagans, and also either foolish Rulers, or most cruel (b) tyrants. — Thus far the Prophet Baruch his words; which are spoken by him unto the people of GOD, of that King who was an heathen, a tyrant, a cruel oppressor of them, and had been a murderer of many thousands of their Nation, and a destroyer of their Country, with a confession that their sins had deserved such a Prince to reign over them. And shall the old Christians by S. Paul's

(a) P. 280. (b) P. 281.

S. Paul's exhortation, pray for Caligula, Claudius, or Nero? Shall the Jews pray for Nebuchodonosor? These Emperors and Kings being strangers unto them, being Pagans, and Infidels, being murtherers, tyrants, and cruel oppressors of them, and destroyers of their Country, countrymen, and kinsmen, the burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities, and Temples? And shall not we pray for the long, prosperous, and godly reign of our Natural Prince?

In the second part of this Homily we have *David*'s behaviour towards his Sovereign King *Saul* propounded to us at large for our loyal Imitation, together with some argumentative Questions and Answers arising from it, whereby the more effectually to press upon all Subjects a due Allegiance and Submission to their unjust, wicked, and tyrannical Princes. But the main of this being set down in the former part of this Discourse (*a*), I pass it over at present, as being what the Reader may find there, if he shall please to cast his eye back to it. Which if he do, he will quickly see that I have not sought to impose upon him, by telling him that our Church has taken occasion from this illustrious Example of good *David*, to recommend a steady Subjection, and a quiet and passive Obedience even to tyrannical and cruel Princes, much more to such as are careless and negligent, and do only *not attend to the End and Design of their Institution*, and the high Office and great Power with which they are entrusted by God.

To this also is subjoined the Instance of the blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of our Saviour Christ, who upon *Augustus*'s Command to the *Jews* that every one should repair to his own Home to be taxed there, though highly in God's favour, though of the Blood Royal of the ancient Kings of *Jury*, and though not only great with Child, and near the time of Delivery, and so very unfit to take a Journy, and especially at that time of the year, the very middle and sharpest of the Winter, and though besides she could expect but very indifferent

(*a*) *Part.* I. *ch.* 3. *p.* 64, 65, 66.

Accommodations when come thither, by reason of the mighty Concourse that might be expected upon such an occasion, especially for one in her condition, yet notwithstanding all these Impediments, She did not disdain to obey the commandment of an heathen, and foreign Prince, when GOD had placed such one over them. —— (a) This Obedience, says the Homily, of this most noble, and most vertuous Lady, to a foreign and Pagan Prince, doth well teach us (who in comparison of her are most base, and vile) what ready obedience we do owe to our natural, and gracious Sovereign.

If this be not enough to satisfy us that our Church is for Obedience to heathen and unreasonable Princes, and such as do not duly consult their People's Welfare, let us look forward a little farther, and we shall have the most encouraging and inviting Instance of Patience and Submission the World ever had, and which must inevitably leave all those utterly inexcusable that do not studiously and courageously endeavour to be conformed to it; I mean that of our ever blessed Saviour. Who as he was in himself of infinitely greater Dignity than the greatest Emperor that ever was, so were his Sufferings the most unjust that could be, and yet were in that Extremity, that they needed a more than human Strength and Patience for enduring them. And it is therefore most certain, (b) No example ought to be of more force with us Christians, than the example of Christ, our master and saviour, who though he were the Son of GOD, yet did always behave himself most reverently to such men as were in authority in the World in his time, and he not rebellionsly behaved himself, but openly did teach the Jews to pay Tribute to the Roman Emperor, —— and being brought before Pontius Pilate, a stranger born, and a heathen man, being Lord President of Jury, he acknowledged his authority and power to be given him from GOD, and obeyed patiently the sentence

(a) P. 289. (b) Ibid.

sentence of most painful and shameful death, which the said Judge pronounced, and gave most unjustly against him, without any grudge, murmuring, or evil word once giving.

Besides which we are also told, (*a*) There be many and divers other examples of the Obedience to Princes, even such as be evil, in the New Testament, to the utter confusion of disobedient, and rebellious people, but this one may be an eternal example, which the Son of GOD, and so the Lord of all, Jesus Christ hath given to us his Christians, and servants, and such as may serve for all, to teach us to obey Princes, though strangers, wicked and wrongful, when GOD for our sins shall place such over us.

The whole Aim of the third part of this Homily is to shew, (*b*) What an abominable sin against GOD, and man Rebellion is, and how dreadfully the wrath of GOD is kindled and enflamed against all Rebels, and what horrible plagues, punishments, and deaths, and finally eternal Damnation doth hang over their heads: as how on the contrary, good, and obedient Subjects are in GOD's favour, and be partakers of peace, quietness, and security, with other GOD's manifold blessings in this World, and by his mercy through our Saviour Christ, of life everlasting also in the World to come. The former of which Propositions is closely pursued, and Rebellion proved to be highly offensive to Almighty God, inasmuch as one way or other it occasions the transgression of all his Commandments, and dangerous and destructive to the Communities where it happens, none being secure there of their Liberties, Estates, or Lives, and nothing but Rapine, Confusion, and Disorders, and all sorts of Cruelty and Injustice to be expected; and *lastly* as to the Rebels themselves, that whilst they are in this World, they live in Shame and Infamy, and under the Tortures of a guilty stinging Conscience, and justly do fall headlong into hell when they dye.

(*a*) Ibid. (*b*) P. 292.

The next part of the Homily propounds to shew some Scripture-Examples of Rebels against their Princes, and the condign Punishment they met with for it. And here is observed how (*a*) Some of the children of Israel, being murmurers against their Magistrates appointed over them by GOD, were stricken with foul leprosy: many were burnt up with fire suddenly sent from the Lord: sometime a great sort of thousands were consumed with pestilence: sometime they were stinged to death with a strange kind of fiery serpents: and — some of the captains with their band of murmurers, not dying by any usual or natural death of men, but the earth opening, they with their wives, children, and families, were swallowed quick down into Hell. And presently after comes this Inference, If such strange and horrible plagues did fall upon such Subjects as did only murmur, and speak evil against their heads; what shall become of those most wicked imps of the devil that do conspire, arm themselves, assemble great numbers of armed rebels, and lead them with them against their Prince, and Country, spoiling and robbing, killing and murthering all good Subjects that do withstand them, as many as they may prevail against? What Punishment of their Wickedness such are to expect is farther intimated in the case of *Absalom*, who got his Death by rising against his Father and Sovereign; of *Achitophel*, who became his Accomplice and Adviser in this undutiful Attempt, and (*b*) for lack of an Hangman, a convenient servitour for such a Traytor, went, and hanged up himself; of *Seba*, who lost his Head in *Abel*, where he thought to have secured himself; and of the five Kings who rose up against *Chedorlaomer*, (*c*) unto whom they had promised loyalty and obedience. The like disappointment, we are here taught, is also to be expected by others, whatever fair Pleas they may make for their Resistance; and though they should pretend sundry causes, as the redress

(*a*) P. 299. (*b*) P. 300. (*c*) P. 301.

redreſs of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of all other miſchiefs doth moſt deſtroy) or reformation of Religion, though they have made a great ſhew of holy meaning, by beginning their Rebellions with a counterfeit ſervice of GOD, (as did wicked Abſolon begin his Rebellion with ſacrificing unto GOD) though they diſplay, and bear about enſigns, and banners, which are acceptable to the rude, ignorant common people, great multitudes of whom by ſuch falſe pretences, and ſhews they do deceive, and draw unto them; yet —— the ſpeedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what number, ſtate, or condition ſoever they were, or what colour or cauſe ſoever they pretended, is, and ever hath been ſuch, that GOD thereby doth ſhew that he alloweth neither the dignity of any perſon, nor the multitude of any people, nor the weight of any cauſe, as ſufficient for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion againſt their Princes. The two common Pretences for all Attempts of this nature are ſaid to be (*a*) Religion, and the Redreſs of the Commonwealth. And as to both theſe it is argued, that it muſt be a very indifferent ſort of Religion ſuch Men by ſuch means would reſtore, even as good a Religion ſurely, as Rebels be good men, and obedient ſubjects, and as Rebellion is a good mean of redreſs and reformation, being itſelf the greateſt deformation of all that may poſſible be; and concerning pretences of any redreſs of the Commonwealth, made by Rebels, every man that hath but half an eye, may ſee how vain they be, Rebellion being, as I have before declared, the greateſt ruin, and deſtruction of all Commonwealths that may be poſſible. Though many cauſes of Rebellion, ſaith the fifth part, (*b*) may be reckoned, and almoſt as many as there be vices in men and women, as hath been before noted; yet — the

(*a*) P. 302. (*b*) P. 307.

most usual causes are these two, Ambition and Ignorance. By Ambition is meant, the unlawful, and restless desire in men, to be of higher estate than GOD hath given or appointed unto them. By Ignorance is meant, no unskilfulness in Arts or Sciences, but the lack of knowledge of GOD's blessed Will declared in his holy Word, which teacheth both extremely to abhor all Rebellion, as being the root of all mischief, and specially to delight in Obedience, as the beginning and foundation of all goodness, as hath been also before specified. The former of these is particularly argued against through the remainder of this part of the Homily, and is especially applied to the Pope and Church of *Rome*. The other, is the subject of the last part of the Homily; and the *Popes* of *Rome* are charged with having made great use of the Peoples Ignorance, for disturbing and subjecting to themselves this Realm of *England*. All which I let pass, as of less concern to us in this present Controversy.

Thus I have shewn the Judgment of our Church in this Point, not only from the Sayings of its Prelates, and others of the Inferiour Clergy, from time to time, condemning all Resistance of the Higher Powers, as contrary to the Laws of our Religion, and a ready way to everlasting Destruction; but likewise from the Doctrine of the Church's Homilies, declaring the use of the Sword to be committed by God to the Magistrate, and not therefore to be taken up by any without his order; and therefore by no means to be used against himself: That to withstand him, is to withstand God's Ordinance, and incurr the Penalty of Damnation: That Sovereign Princes are God's Lieutenants, and Officers; and Obedience is due to them not only for fear of Punishment from them, but out of Conscience, and as we would not offend Almighty God, whose Officers and Lieutenants they are; professing, that *it is not lawful for Inferiours and Subjects, IN ANY CASE, to resist and stand against the Superiour Powers*; recommending good *David's* Example, who would upon no Provocation be

pre-

prevailed with to behave himself otherwise towards King *Saul*, than as became a dutiful and obedient Subject; condemning all murmuring disrespectful Language towards our Superiours, much more all Resistance, all Commotions, Insurrections, and Rebellions; and teaching rather, *patiently to suffer all Wrongs and Injuries, referring the Judgment of our Cause to God only:* affirming bad, as well as good Princes, to reign by God only; and stigmatizing Rebellion, *as the greatest of all Mischiefs*, and Rebels as *the worst of Subjects*, and *of Men, worse than the worst of Princes*; and their Rebellion, *as worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince that hitherto hath been*; noting withal the principal Causes of, and Motives to Rebellion, and the heavy Judgments God has inflicted upon such as were guilty of it in this World, besides everlasting Torments denounced against them in the next.

And could it have been thought after this, that Non-resistance should not be allow'd to be the Doctrine of our Church? Could it have been imagined, that any Man of common Sense, who had read these Passages which I have here recited, and those abundantly more refer'd to in the History of Passive Obedience, could ever conceive the Doctrine of Resistance to be the Doctrine of our Divines and Homilies? Or that Passive Obedience is not here as expresly taught as may be? Yet Mr. *H.* it seems cannot find it to be so. It is not for the Reputation of his Scheme, that it should appear contradictory to the avowed Doctrine of the Church whereof he is a Minister; and therefore it is not to be thought the Church can ever have avowed such a Doctrine, though her Words are as plain, and as uncapable of any other Interpretation as can be. To this therefore Mr. *H.* returns Answer, first as to the Judgment of our Divines, and then as to the Homilies.

1. As to the Judgment of our Divines, He is (*a*) *heartily sorry it should be found to be so*, that is, that his Doctrine and theirs should not agree: *But* his comfort

(*a*) *Measures of Submission*, p. 153.

sort is, *this can never prove any thing against the truth of* what he has undertaken to maintain. *For there was a time, in which any one who should have spoken against* Transubstantiation, *and many other absurd Opinions, would have had the same sort of* Objection *made against him.* Very true! There was a Time, when the Nation was overrun with Popery and its Errors. But it is an odd consequence from hence, that because divers Errors had for some time been generally maintained, apparently contrary to Scripture, and the Doctrines and Practices of the Primitive Church, therefore there is no regard to be had to the Judgment of those who have shaken off these Errors, and have both the Scripture and all the purest Antiquity on their Side; as I have fully shewn our Divines to have in this Case. He adds, *And since the Reformation there was as universal a* Consent *against the Lawfulness of all* Usury, *as there can be produced against the Lawfulness of all Resistance.* But what Proof does Mr. *H.* give of this? Has he as large a Catalogue of the Writers against *Usury*, as the *History of Passive Obedience* presents him with against *Resistance?* If he has, I must own his Objection to be of Force: But till that be done, I hope he will not require such an Assertion to be assented to purely upon his Word for it. That Bishop (*b*) *Andrews*, and several others were against all manner of Usury, and that amongst them, Bishop (*c*) *Sanderson* declaims rather than argues against it, I readily grant; but that at any time since the Reformation there was such an universal Consent against it, as has been proved to have been against Resistance, is not so very evident: I am sure Mr. *H.* has said nothing to prove there was; and till he shall prove it, I am not bound to concern myself with his bare Affirmation. He proceeds: *But indeed there is no Argument more destructive to Truth, and the Cause of True Religion, than that taken from* Authority, *which if once it be admitted in one* Case, *must be admitted so far in others, as for ever to ruin*

(*b*) De usuris Theolog. Determinat.
(*c*) *Serm. on* 1 Cor. 7. 24. *p.* 31.

ruine the Cauſe *of* Truth *and* Goodneſs *in the World.* Yet after all, it is very certain, that the conſentient Judgment of the moſt Eminent and Learned Divines of any Church, are, next to its publick Declarations of whatever Sort, whether by way of Article, of Homily, or Catechiſm, or howſoever elſe; next to theſe, I ſay, the conſentient Judgment of the generality of its Divines, and eſpecially of the Principal and moſt Eminent of them, is the beſt Evidence of a Church's Doctrine; which whoſoever profeſſes himſelf a Member of, much more a Prieſt and Miniſter of that Church, will not readily find himſelf at liberty to depart from, whilſt he continues ſuch. And to prove this, is what their Sayings are cited for. So that Mr. *H.* may cenſure an Appeal to them, and charge it to be as *unfair and unmanly* as he pleaſes, yet ſo long as it anſwers the Deſign for which they are appealed to, he will not ſo eaſily ſhake them off.

But now Mr. *H.* comes cloſer to the Point, and denies *the Foundation of this Objection*; becauſe *there have been many Divines of the firſt Rank, in theſe latter Ages, who have publickly eſpouſed the Doctrine he has taught, or laid down ſuch* Principles, *as inevitably tend to it.* Of theſe he names Mr. *Hooker* and Biſhop *Bilſon*, as Favourers of his Notions: and a little after adds Dr. *Falkener*, and many of the higheſt Aſſerters of Non-reſiſtance, who he ſays, *when they were obliged to ſpeak out upon ſome Suppoſitions, do plainly allow of the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance.* No doubt, ſuch as thus allowed the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance, were very high Aſſerters of Non-reſiſtance. But to let that paſs, and the many others he has not thought fit to name, becauſe he could not; let us ſee what thoſe three he does name ſay to his Purpoſe. It is not his manner to tell the Reader in what part of an Author's Works, what he quotes from him is to be found. Inſtead of this, he leaves him either to take it ſolely upon his Credit, or elſe if this do not ſatisfy, to be at the trouble of turning over and ſearching till he find it: And thus he has done here; but however that ſhall not hinder me from following him, as well as I can, where I am left wholly to gueſs at

what

what Paſſages in them he referrs to. Mr. *Hooker* indeed affirms, (*c*) that *For any Prince or Potentate, of what kind ſoever upon Earth, to exerciſe the ſame,* [the Power of making Laws, to command whole Politick Societies of Men] of himſelf, *and not either by expreſs Commiſſion immediately and perſonally received from God, or elſe by Authority derived at the firſt from their Conſent, upon whoſe Perſons they impoſe Laws, it is no better than mere Tyranny.* Whether this be what Mr. *H.* quotes him for, I know not. If it be, I would anſwer, That Mr. *Hooker* here tells us how a Prince may degenerate into a Tyrant; but does not ſay that a Tyrant may be lawfully reſiſted by his People: Which was the only Point that would have been of any Service to Mr. *H.* and his Doctrine of Reſiſtance. I muſt deſire Mr. *H.* alſo farther to obſerve, that in the *Clavi Trabales*, publiſhed by Dr. *Nicholas Bernard*; where he gives us an account of Mr. *Hooker*'s Judgment concerning the King's Power, *&c.* he concludes that imperfect Diſcourſe of this Great Man with theſe words: *A Well-ſpring there is, and a Supreme Head of Juſtice whereunto all are ſubject, but itſelf in ſubjection to none. Which kind of Preheminence if ſome ought to have in a Kingdom, who but the King ſhall have it? Kings therefore no Man can have lawful Power and Authority to judge. If private Men offend, there is the* Magiſtrate *over them, which judges; if* Magiſtrates, *they have their* Prince. *If Princes, there is* Heaven, *a Tribunal before which they ſhall appear, on Earth they are not accomptable to any*; and conſequently not reſiſtible. This is Mr. *Hooker*'s Opinion of Reſiſtance. Next comes Biſhop *Bilſon*; and I muſt confeſs Mr. *H.* is not ſingular in appealing to him, for divers others have taken upon them to do it, before him, and yet what Advantage he will get by it, is paſt my underſtanding. (*d*) For all that he ſays is, that in thoſe

(*c*) *Eccleſ. Polity.* l. 1. c. 10. p. 21. (*a*) P. 94.

(*d*) Theophilus. *The tumults of any Subjects againſt their Sovereigns, as we do not allow; ſo may we not condemn the poor afflicted Chriſtians, our neighbours, before we hear them*

what

those Countries where the Constitution is such, as to make the King accountable for his Mismanagement, and by consequence not supreme, he does not condemn the Resistance of such nominal Kings. Now it will puzzle Mr.

---

what they can say for their defence. Admit them to their answer, and then if their attempts be like yours, or themselves of the same mind that you are, we reject their doings, as hateful before God and man, no less than yours. Your Spanish Inquisitions, and French Massacres, when you murdered men, women, and children, by 1000, *and* 10000, *against the very grounds of all equity, piety, charity, and humanity, without convicting, accusing, or so much as calling before any Judge to hear what was misliked in them, are able to set grave men and good men at their wits ends; and to make them justly doubt, since you refuse the course of all divine and human laws with them, whether by the law of nature they may not defend themselves against such barbarous blood-suckers: yet we stand not on that; if the laws of the land, where they converse, do not permit them to guard their lives, when they are assaulted with unjust force against law; or if they take arms as you do to depose Princes,* WE WILL NEVER EXCUSE THEM FROM REBELLION. Philander. *Then they may resist, but we may not.* Theo. *Your lives are not hunted after* ——— *You mean to deprive Princes, they seek no farther but to defend themselves; not denying to their Princes any tribute, subjection, or honour, which the laws of their Country require:* ——— *These be differences enough between your Wars and theirs; and yet for my part I must confess, that except the laws of those Realms do permit the people to stand on their right, if the Prince would offer that wrong,* I DARE NOT ALLOW THEIR ARMS. Phi. *What their laws permit I know not; I am sure in the mean time they resist.* Theo. *And we, because we do not exactly know what their laws permit, see no reason to condemn their doings, without hearing their answer.* Phi. *Think you their laws permit them to rebell?* Theo. *I busy not myself in other mens Commonwealths, as you do, neither will I rashly pronounce all that resist to be rebels: Cases may fall out even in Christian Kingdoms, where the people may plead their right against the Prince, and not be charged with Rebellion.* Phi. *As when for example?* Theo. *If a Prince should go about to subject his Kingdom to a foreign Realm, or change the form of the Commonwealth, from impery to tyranny; or neglect the laws esta-*

Mr. *H.* with all his Ingenuity, to shew what this signifies to our Nation, where the Supremacy is undoubtedly in the Prince. To make our Sovereign accountable for his

---

established by the common consent of Prince and people, to execute his own pleasures: In these and other cases, which might be named, If the Nobles and Commons join together, to defend their ancient and accustomed liberty, regiment and laws, they may not well be counted rebels. Phi. *You denied that even now when I did urge it.* Theo. *I denied that Bishops had authority to prescribe conditions to Kings when they crowned them; but I never denied that the people might preserve the foundation, freedom and form of their Commonwealth, which they foeprised, when they first consented to have a King.* Phi. *I remember you were resolute that subjects might not resist their Princes for any respects, and now I see you slake.* Theo. *As I said then, so I say now, the law of God giveth no man leave to resist his Prince; but I never said that Kingdoms and Commonwealths might not proportion their States as they thought best by their publick laws, which afterward the Princes themselves may not violate. By superiour Powers ordained of God, we understand not only Princes, but all politick States and Regiments, somewhere the People, somewhere the Nobles, having the same interest to the Sword, that Princes have in their Kingdoms: and in Kingdoms where Princes bear rule, by the Sword we do not mean the Prince's private will, against his laws; but his Precept derived from his laws, and agreeing with his laws: which though it be wicked, yet may it not be resisted of any subject with armed violence. Many, when Princes offer their subjects not justice, but force; and despise all laws to practise their lusts: not every, nor any private man may take the Sword to redress the Prince; but if the laws of the Land appoint the Nobles as next to the King to assist him in doing right, and withold him from doing wrong, then be they licensed by mans law, and so not prohibited by God's, to interpose themselves for the safeguard of equity and innocency; and by all lawful and needful means to procure the Prince to be reformed,* BUT IN NOWISE DEPRIVED, WHERE THE SCEPTER IS INHERITED. Phi. *If I should assent to this, how doth it acquit your fellows in* Germany, Flanders, France, *and* Scotland, *that resist their Catholick Princes for maintenance of their Heresies?* Theo. *Not unless they prove their States to be such as I speak of.* The true difference between Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion. *Part.* III. *p.* 519, 520, 521.

his Government, becauſe the Kings of *Sparta* and *Hungary* were ſo, and thoſe of *Poland* are ſaid to be ſtill ſo, is a Method of Arguing that the Biſhop could never be guilty of. Nor is it very juſt in divers others, as well as Mr. *H.* to charge it upon him. And yet I am ſure, without it, all he ſays ſignifies nothing to the Point in hand. For here he poſitively declares, that *unleſs the Laws of the Land permit them to guard their Lives, when unjuſtly aſſaulted, he never will excuſe them from Rebellion, and dares not allow their Arms.* And if Mr. *H.* can make this a Plea for reſiſting any *Engliſh* Princes, much good may it do him. But if it be a poſitive Condemnation of his Doctrine, what can be thought of him, and ſome others that have trumped up ſome part of it, as divided from the reſt, in favour of illegal Reſiſtance? The beſt Excuſe I can make for them is, that they ſeemed to have quoted it at ſecond hand, and never looked into the Biſhop's Book, to ſee the Senſe and Coherence of what they quoted. The Biſhop will not admit the *Spaniſh* Inquiſitions, and *French* Maſſacres, *wherein*, to keep to his own Words, *they murdered Men, Women and Children, by Thouſands and Ten Thouſands, againſt the very Grounds of all Equity, Piety, Charity, and Humanity; without convicting, accuſing, or ſo much as calling them before any Judge, to hear what was miſliked in them*; he will not, I ſay, admit even theſe inhuman Proceedings towards Subjects, to be a juſtifiable Cauſe of taking up Arms againſt Law. Which is as odd an Evidence of this Biſhop's Approbation of the Reſiſtance Mr. *H.* has taught, and for which he is ſo ſtrenuous an Advocate, as ever was heard of; there being nothing in all the Biſhop ſays, that is not directly and poſitively againſt it. I come now to Dr. *Falkner*, whom Mr. *H.* avows to be of his Side with ſo much aſſurance, that I cannot perſwade myſelf he has ever read what the Doctor ſays upon this Subject. *Nay*, ſays Mr. *H. Dr.* Falkner, *and many of the higheſt Aſſerters of Non-reſiſtance, when they are obliged to ſpeak out upon ſome Suppoſitions, do plainly allow the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance.* His many Aſſertors of Non-reſiſtance, ſince he names none of them, I leave to himſelf. But the Learned Dr. *Falkner* needs

to

to have Juſtice done him againſt ſuch a groundleſs Aſperſion as this is. He indeed as well as Bp. *Bilſon* hath upon occaſion been repreſented as a Patron of *Reſiſtance*; and now, Mr. *H.* tells, *he plainly allows the Lawfulneſs of it.* Yet he neither gives us his Words, nor mentions the Place where this Allowance is made. But if he means in the ſecond Book of his *Chriſtian Loyalty*, *Chap.* 5. *pag.* 544. I muſt aſſure him, though I charitably believe he has never read what the Doctor ſays there, yet I have done it very carefully, and can ſee nothing in it, but what is full againſt his Doctrine. The Doctor ſpeaks of the *Pariſian* Maſſacre, as the Biſhop had done before him; and owns, if ſuch a Caſe as that could be ſuppoſed to happen here, it would have its great Difficulties. Which is directly againſt Mr. *H.* who would make no Difficulty in the Caſe, but upon a far leſs Temptation would readily determine, that the People were highly to blame, if they ſhould ſit ſtill, and not Arm in their own Defence: He would cry out of a *Paſſive Non-reſiſtance* in ſuch a dreadful Juncture, as the ſure way to ruin themſelves, and their Poſterity after them. But Dr. *Falkner* ſays no ſuch matter; he ſays, ſuch a Caſe *would have its great Difficulties*, if ſuppoſed; but is very unwilling to ſuppoſe any thing like it. Then he mentions *Grotius*'s Judgment concerning it, who *thinks, that in this utmoſt Extremity, the uſe of Self-defence, as a laſt Refuge, is not to be condemned*; and ſays, *If this be true, it muſt be upon this Ground, that ſuch Attempts of Ruining do* ipſo facto *include a diſclaiming the governing thoſe Perſons as* Subjects, *and conſequently of being their Prince or King.* But he does by no means ſay, that it is either true, or does imply ſuch a Diſclaimer; but declares on the other hand, that *there is greater Hurt to be feared from the making ſuch* Suppoſitions, *than from the Thing ſuppoſed*; citing withal the forementioned Paſſage of Bp. *Bilſon*, and concluding with him, that *If the Laws of the Land do not permit them to guard their Lives when thus aſſaulted, or* IF THEY TAKE ARMS TO DEPOSE PRINCES, WE WILL NEVER EXCUSE THEM FROM REBELLION.

But

But though all these sadly fail Mr. *H.* giving their Judgment, not for, but against him, he has yet another Reserve, which he looks upon as *of most Moment*; that is, of the whole *Convocation*, the *Church of* England's *Representative*, in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, publickly acknowledging *it Glorious, to assist Subjects in the Resistance to their Sovereigns, and their Endeavours to rid themselves of their Tyranny and Oppressions.* Now who that reads this, but would immediately expect to find some Article or Canon to this purpose to be set before him for his Satisfaction, that they did make such a publick acknowledgment; or at least to have been directed to the Place in the Journals, or to some Writer of those Times, for the proof of it? But this is a vulgar way of procedure, and below an Author of Mr. *H.*'s Form. It is enough for him to say it, and if his Book fall into the hand of any that will not subscribe to his αὐτὸς ἔφη, they may turn over as many Volumes as they please, to see what they can find about it. But now after all, what if all this prove a meer Chimera and Imagination, and not only this pretended Acknowledgement, that *It is glorious to assist Subjects in their Resistance to their Sovereigns, is no where to be found* either in the Journals or Histories of those Times; but is moreover contrary to (*e*) the Professions made by the Queen, and

P and

(*e*) *Consonantly whereto Sir* Nicholas Throgmorton, *Queen* Elizabeth's *Minister in* Scotland, *argued in behalf of their Queen*, That Obedience was to be yielded unto the Higher Powers, that carry the Sword; and the Queen was not subject to the judgment of any, but only of the Celestial Judge: That she could not be arraigned or brought to tryal before any Judge on the Earth: and That there is no Magistrate had any authority in *Scotland*, which is not derived from the authority of the Queen, and revocable at her pleasure. *Stranguage*'s *Hist. of Mary Q. of Scotland. An.* 1567. *p.* 39. *Contrà Throcmortonus è sacrarum literarum authoritate de obsequio præstando* supereminentioribus potestatibus gladium gestantibus *multa proposuit, acriterq; disseruit* Reginam nullius judicio præterquam cœlestis Judicis subjacere, pro nullius Tribu-

and the Doctrins taught and maintained by Archbiſhop *Whitgift* and Biſhop *Bancroft*, the two principal Men in that Convocation? If this be ſo, what will Mr. *H.* ſay for himſelf? Or what muſt the World think of his Writings, if he appear guilty of ſo groſs an Impoſition upon them, as this muſt be, if it cannot be made out? I challenge him therefore to produce any thing of the Convocation that ſpeaks to this purpoſe, with a Promiſe, if he does it to any effect, that I will for the future have a greater regard for his confident Aſſertions, than I can yet bring myſelf to. But before he undertakes ſo hard a Task, I would beg of him to conſult a Pamphlet printed in the Year 1690, and intituled, *A Defence of the Profeſſion, which the Right Reverend Father in God* John *late Lord Biſhop of* Chicheſter *made upon his Death-Bed*, from the 18th Page (falſly marked 26th) to the 38th, where he will find the Learned and Worthy Author has ſo entirely routed this vain Pretence, that I cannot imagin he will ever undertake the Proof of it: I am ſure till he does give ſome better Evidence for ſuch an Aſſertion, than I have yet been able to meet with, I muſt look upon it as a vain Boaſt, without any Foundation.

In ſhort, after Mr. *H.*'s Brags, that *It doth not appear, that there hath been any Number of Men of Senſe and Conſideration, who have in reality condemned* Reſiſtance of the Higher Powers *in all Poſſible Caſes*, I cannot find he has yet inſtanced in one ſuch who has not actually done it; whilſt on the contrary, great Numbers of them have been produced that have done it, from time to time: Which is abundantly enough, as to the Judgment of our Divines. And now,

2. As

Tribunali in terris poſſe ſiſti, nullam eſſe magiſtratûs authoritatem in Scotiâ quæ à Reginæ authoritate non eſt delegata, & ab ipſâ revocabilis. *Cambden. Elizab. Ang. Regin. An.* 1567. *p.* 115. *And the Author of* Le Martyre de la Royne d'Eſcoſſe *owns that ſhe promiſed their Queen, by this Sir* N. Throgmorton, *that ſhe would give her all the Aid and Aſſiſtance in her power, if the* Scotch *Subjects would not return to their Allegiance.* p. 138.

2. As to the Homilies, he tells us (f) he has *many things to offer in Reply*, and makes this the subject of several of the following Leaves. Hither therefore I should have followed him, and shewn how effectually he hath perform'd his Undertaking. But being happily prevented by an ingenious and worthy Person, who has had occasion to take this Task upon him, and has discharged it with very good success, in the Treatise hereto annexed, I forbear to say any thing of it here; and referr the Reader to that Treatise; where he will easily discover to how little purpose Mr. *H.* had taken all the Pains he has been at, to bring the Homilies to the Sense of his Sermon; whilst every one else must needs see they plainly speak the Language of his Text, with S. *Paul* utterly condemning that Resistance, which Mr. *H.* is so desirous they should be thought to patronize.

CHAP. IV.

Whether Mr. H.'s Doctrine of Resistance be consistent with our own Municipal Laws?

HERE I must acquaint the Reader, that I do not pretend to give him a full account of what our Laws and Lawyers say against Resistance, but only to set before him such little Notices of this kind as have happened in my way. And I also beg Pardon of the Gentlemen of that Profession, that I should venture to meddle in a Faculty, in the Study whereof I have been so little conversant, and where I shall be sure to say so little, in comparison of what might justly be said upon so copious a subject. Yet I cannot doubt but that little Evidence I have to produce, under this head, is however a great deal more than Mr. *H.* will

(f) P. 157.

(B) A Letter to a Clergy-Man concerning Mr Hoadly's Doctrine about ye Homilies and Resistance. By Mr Stamp.

ever be able to give a solid and satisfactory Answer to. For in truth I do not think Sir *Dudley Digges*, or even the History of Passive Obedience, no nor S. *Paul*'s thirteenth to the *Romans*, to be more manifestly and diametrically opposite to all Resistance of our Sovereign, than the *English* Constitution, and known Laws are. And it is very hard to conceive, and will require all Mr. *H.*'s Flourishes and Wit, to shew how what is condemned by the Laws of the Land, in conjunction with the Divine Laws, should yet not only become Lawful, but commence an important Duty, *honourable* and *glorious*, for no other reason, but because the contrary Practice may be attended with temporal Difficulties and Sufferings, and possibly with some present Inconveniences to the Communities where it obtains.

Now that Mr. *H.*'s dear Resistance stands condemned by the Divine Laws, and was acknowledged to be so both by the ancient Christian Church, when in its greatest Purity, and by our own Church ever since the Reformation, I have so fully proved, as to leave no manner of Plea for it, except upon Supposition, that our Prince were not really sovereign in his Dominions, but made accountable by the Constitution, and the Statutes now in force, to some either of the Nobles, or of the Commons, or of both together; in whom the Sovereignty were therefore to reside. This Supposition, I say, is all the Subterfuge that is left for opening a door to the Resistance pleaded for; and if this fail too, it will require a very good Assurance to appear for it, against all the Proof to the contrary, that the *Nature* of the thing is capable of, or that could be reasonably expected or desired, supposing the case to be as I have stated it.

If the Doctrine of Resistance had ever been intended, as THE MEASURE of the *English* Subjects SUBMISSION TO THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE, it is astonishing to think, that it should never have been enacted in Parliament, and the Bounds and Limits set to it, that no Directions should be given for the due Performance of it, nor any Rewards offered, or Honours designed,

or Advantages propounded for its Encouragement. The Maintenance of the Rights of the Community, and of our Posterity after us for many Generations, is not of so little Importance, as that it can be conceived our Legislators should never have thought it worth enjoining the only Method, if Mr. *H.* may be believed, of securing so great a Good. If some of them had happened to be careless and negligent, and have no regard for the Publick Welfare, nor once aim at recommending an *honourable* and *glorious* Prosecution of it; yet sure our Senators have not been all successively asleep for hundreds of Years together. Or if they had, who would believe the whole Body of the People to have been so too, and that none of these would try to awake them, and put them upon consulting how this our only means of Safety might be managed, to the benefit of all succeeding Generations? And till it can be shewn that they have taken this course, and have expresly prescribed Resistance of the Prince, in case of Mal-administration, as necessarily incumbent upon the Nation, or at least have declared us at liberty to resist, whensoever we shall think it proper, such Resistance can no way be said to be according to Law.

Supremacy naturally includes in it Irresistibility, inasmuch as none being Higher than the Highest, or Superiour to the Supreme, none therefore can have a right to call him to account for his Irregularities. It is an inconteſtable Truth that Inferiours have no power over their Superiours; and by consequence Subjects can have none over their Sovereign. And hence to make any Prince accountable to his People, must be only by some Compact between them, whereby the Supremacy is not properly placed in Him, but in some other Person or Persons, to whom he is, by virtue of this Compact, to be answerable for his Government. And were this the Nature of our Constitution, as it has been of some other Nations, it ought not to depend upon an imaginary, invisible *Original Contract*, but to be legible in some known authentick Record, that might testify the Time and Manner of making this Agreement, the Terms

of the Prince's Forfeiture, the particular Persons that were to take the Advantage of it, and the Judges that were to determine between them. And can Mr. *H.* say there is any thing like this to be found in our Law? His pretending only to be told *that the King is declared to be the Minister of God, only as he performs the positive Will of God, by doing all manner of good Service to his People,* shews him sensible that there is nothing of this to be produced from any good Authority, inasmuch as if he had the least knowledge of any, we should have been sure to hear of it with both Ears. His saying no more for himself than he does, is an abundant Proof, that he is quite run aground, and has nothing but his own Imagination to rely upon. He has nothing to plead from the Statute-Book, nor from the Common Law; that is, in short, he has nothing in our Constitution, whereon to found so groundless, as well as mischievous a Doctrine, as that of Resistance is.

What then can we judge of this Doctrine, if it not only be not taught in our Laws, but on the contrary be over and over condemned there, and under the severest Penalties, and without a Reserve for any particular case? If this does not make it highly illegal, it is impossible that any Law or Sanction whatever can make it so.

Now to satisfy the Reader that this is no vain Conceit of mine, no Hearsay-Story of I know not what *old Law*, that neither is now, nor ever was in being, but what we have the concurrent Testimony of Laws and Lawyers for, I shall proceed by these following Steps.

1. The King by our Law is the supreme Governor of these Nations. *Rex parem non habet*, says *Bracton* (*a*), *nec superiorem in Regno suo:* The *King has neither superiour nor equal in his Kingdom.* And again, (*b*) *Omnes quidem sub Rege, & ipse sub nullo, nisi tantùm sub Deo:* All *else are under the King, but he is under none but God.*

Parem

(*a*) De leg. & consuet. Angl. *l.* 2. *c.* 37. *sect.* 5. *fol.* 87.
(*b*) L. 1. c. 8.

Parem autem non habet in Regno suo, &c. *He has no equal in his Kingdom, because so he would lose his power of Commanding, since one equal has no Authority over another. Much less has he a Superiour, nor ought any to be of greater Power than he, because so he would be below his Subjects, which would be a great Absurdity. And he ought to be under* no Man, but under God and the Law, that is, the direction of it, *because the Law makes him a King*; that is, distinguishes him as such from a Tyrant, who resolves not to be directed by the Laws. As is plain from the following Words, *Non est enim Rex, ubi dominatur Voluntas, & non Lex:* For *he is no King, who is governed merely by his own Will, and not by the Laws he is to act by.* And especially by what is added in another place, (*b*) *He is called King, not barely from his Governing, but from his Ruling well, for whilst he does this, he is a King, but when he imperiously oppresses his People, he is a Tyrant.* (*c*) This is a full Acknowledgment of the King's Supremacy, in that it allows him neither superiour, nor equal, in all his Dominions. And what the result of this Supremacy is in this same *Bracton*'s Opinion, follows at the end of that Chapter; namely, that supposing the King manages his Power ill, so as to give occasion for application to him for redress, then *locus erit supplicationi, quòd factum suum corrigat & emendet, quod*

(*b*) Dicitur enim rex à bene regendo, sed non regnando, quia *rex* est dum bene regit, tyrannus dum populum sibi creditum violentâ opprimit dominatione. *l.* 3. *c.* 9.

(*c*) *In what Sence these Words of the same Author*, l. 3. c. 9. Rex habet superiorem Deum, item legem per quam factus est Rex, item curiam suam, videlicet Barones, qui Comites dicuntur, quasi socii Regis, & qui habet socium habet magistrum, & ideo si Rex fuerit sine frœno, i. e. sine lege, debent ei frœnum ponere; *in what Sence, I say, these Words are to be understood, has been long since shewn by the very learned Author of* the Harmony of Divinity and Law, *printed in the Year* 1684. p. 40, 41; *and in the* Royal Apology *printed the same Year, from* p. 25. *to* p. 37. *In which Discourses they are sufficiently explained, and reconciled to the constant Doctrine of this famed Lawyer, and shewn to be no way inconsistent with what I have here cited from him in behalf of Non-resistance.*

quidem si non fecerit, satis sufficit ei ad pœnam quòd Dominum expectet ultorem: It is *Punishment enough for him*, not as Mr. *H.* would have said, that his Subjects are to rise up against him for the preservation of their own Rights, and those of their Posterity; but *that he is to expect, that* GOD *Almighty*, his only superiour Lord, *will take him to task for it.* Or though God should not do this presently, *no Man*, says the same *Bracton* (*d*), *may presume to call his Actions in question, much less to oppose him with force and violence.* This, as the loyal Judge *Jenkyns* observes (*e*), *shews where the Supreme Power is.* And what Rights belong to this supreme Power, the said *Bracton* teaches in another place; *(f) Sciendum quòd ipse Dominus Rex, &c.* You *are to take notice that our Lord the King, who has ordinary Jurisdiction, and Dignity, and Power over all that are in his Kingdom, has also in his hand all the Rights pertaining to the Crown, to the Lay-Power, and the material Sword, as necessary for the Government of the Kingdom. He has likewise Justice, Judgment, and Jurisdiction, that by the help of these he may recompense each one according to his deserts, as becomes God's Minister, and Representative. It is in him to keep the Peace, and suppress Quarrels, Robberies, and Murders. He can coerce, and restrain, and punish Malefactors; can require his known approved Laws to be carefully observed, since otherwise his People are never the better for them.* So also at another time he tells us, when the King being petitioned to redress the Subjects Grievances shall refuse it, though he wrongs his Subjects, he is yet to answer it to God only. *Cum Dominus Rex super hoc fuerit interpellatus, si in eâdem perstiterit voluntate, quòd velit tenentem esse defensum cum injuria, cum teneatur justitiam totis viribus defensare, ex tunc erit injuria ipsius Domini Regis, nec poterit ei necessitatem aliquis imponere, quòd illam corrigat & emendet nisi velit, cum superiorem non habeat nisi Deum, & satis erit illi pro pœnâ quòd Deum expectet ultorem: (g)* When *our Lord the King being addressed*

(*d*) Ibid. (*e*) Jenkins. rediv. *p.* 3.
(*f*) L. 2. c. 24. sect. 1. fol. 55.
(*g*) L. 3. Tract. 3. c. 3. sect. 3. fol. 368.

dreſſed to for relief ſtill perſiſts in the ſame mind, reſolving to defend one to the wrong and damage of another, againſt the Obligation he is under to adhere to the Rules of Juſtice in all his Proceedings, the Injury then is his; yet ſtill no Man may undertake to force him to reform what is amiſs, unleſs he conſent to it himſelf, becauſe he has no ſuperiour but God, and it is Puniſhment enough for him, that he muſt expect to be called to account for it by God. Here is ſufficient Proof of the King's Supremacy, if it be capable of Proof from Mr. *H.*'s old Law, which thus expreſly teaches what is here related. And if this be not good Evidence, I hope his *old Law* will be owned to be of no force, though it had been much more to ~~the point~~ his purpoſe than it is.

And the Lord Chief Juſtice *Coke* in *Cawdrey*'s Caſe, (*h*) delivers it as an undoubted Truth, That *by the ancient Laws of this Realm, this Kingdom of* England *is an abſolute Empire and Monarchy, conſiſting of one Head,* (*i*) *which is the King, and a Body politick, compact, and compounded of many, and almoſt infinite ſeveral, yet well agreeing Members,* ——— *next and immediately under God, ſubject and obedient to the Head,* &c. This I hope Mr. *H.* will allow to be a full and clear Acknowledgment of the King's ſupreme Authority, and Juriſdiction; and that, according to this great Oracle of the Law, all his People, the whole Community as well as particular Perſons, owe him Allegiance and Subjection. It is noted alſo by the ſame great Lawyer, that in the nineteenth Year of *Edw.* III. the Archbiſhop of *York* was ſued in the King's name, for non-admiſſion of a Clerk to a Benefice in that Dioceſe; (*k*) where he is charged with high Contempt againſt the King, his Crown, and Dignity, (*l*) *in refuſing to execute his Sovereign's Command.* And we are told moreover, that in the

(*h*) *Rep. To.* 5. De jure Regis Eccleſiaſt.

(*i*) *In direct Contradiction to Mr.* H.*'s Determination, That* the King, Lords and Commons are more properly the Head of that Publick, in which we are concerned. *Pref. to his ſecond Edition. p.* 7. (*k*) Ibid.

(*l*) Supremi Domini Mandata. *So likewiſe the King's Crown is ſtiled* Corona Supremi Domini Regis. *ibid. & alibi paſſim.*

the time of the said *Edw.* III. (*m*) it is often resolved, that the last Lapse of an Ecclesiastical Benefice is to the King, *tanquam SUPREMO intra Regnum suum*, as *the* SUPREME *within his own Kingdom.* Which Assertion, though particularly levelled against the vain Pretences of the *Pope*, to a Jurisdiction over these Nations, is nevertheless expressed in such general Terms, as to imply an indisputable Supremacy over all his Subjects. And in the conclusion of that Case, the Effect of all that went before is declared to be, That **as well by the antient Common Laws of this Realm of** England, **in all succession of Ages, and by authority of many Acts of Parliament, antient and of later times, the Kingdom of** England **is an absolute Monarchy, and the King is** (*n*) **the only supreme Governor, as well over Ecclesiastical Persons, and in Ecclesiastical Causes, as Temporal, within this Realm.**

And that the King has a supreme Authority over all, is farther evident from the Oath of Homage taken antiently by Tenants to their Lords; which had always this Reservation in it, (*o*) *Saving the Faith that I owe unto our* SOVEREIGN *Lord the King.*

But not to insist farther upon the Opinion or Authority of Lawyers, how great soever, nor any Inferences of theirs, how well soever founded, if we consult the Statutes themselves we shall find them likewise to be of the same strain, and that they own no other Supreme Head of the Community, but only the King, or Queen, to whom all Authority under God is attributed by them, and all the People are put in Subjection, and required to pay true Fidelity and Allegiance. I begin with the Statute of *Premunire*, (*p*) whereby it is declared, That *the Crown of* England *hath been so free at all times, That it hath been in no Earthly*

(*m*) Ibid.

(*n*) Quodq; Rex solus & summus sit gubernator, &c.

(*o*) Coke's Instit. *Part.* I. *sect.* 85. (*p*) 16. Rich. II. *c.* 5.

Earthly Subjection, but immediately subject to God in all things, touching the Regality of the same Crown, and to none other; and so, as to no foreign Jurisdiction, so neither to any Power of the People, either the whole, or any part of them. And the Statute for *Restraint of Appeals* (*q*) begins thus, *Whereas by divers sundry and authentick Histories and Chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this Realm of* England *is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the World, governed* **by one Supreme Head and King —— unto whom all sorts and degrees of People, divided in terms, and by names of Spiritualty and Temporalty, been bounden, and owen to bear next to God, a natural and humble Obedience:** *He being also institute and furnished, by the goodness and sufferance of God, with plenary, whole, entire Power, Preeminence, Authority, Prerogative, and Jurisdiction.* —— Does this look as if the King were accountable to his People? or can it be shewn that such singular Privileges were ever ascribed to one that was so, by the Laws of his Land, and the Joint Suffrage of his People? According to this Statute the Realm of *England* is an Empire, the King is the supreme Head of it, and has the entire Power and Authority residing in him, and to him all the People, of whatever sort or degree, are bound to pay their natural Allegiance and Submission. And if this does not prove the Supremacy to be solely in the Prince, next under God, and that next to God he is to be obeyed by all his Subjects, and is accountable to God only, I must come to Mr. *H.* to learn what Words would convince him of it, supposing it ever so true.

Again, another Statute of the same King, concerning *Peter-Pence* and *Dispensations*, (*a*) speaks thus, *This your Grace's Realm recognizing no Superiour under God, but only your Grace,* — Which Words I cannot construe to mean less, than that the King was here owned to be Superiour to all Persons whatsoever within this Realm. And indeed no less is implied in that Title so usually given

(*q*) 24. Hen. VIII. c. 12. (*a*) 25. Hen. VIII. c. 21.

given the Prince, both in the Statutes, and upon all other occasions, of *our SOVEREIGN Lord the King.* For how can he be owned by all to be their *Sovereign*, if the Supremacy be not in him, and he has not a Power paramount to, and uncontroulable by any other Person, or Persons within his Dominions; or even by the whole Community? This is so plain and undeniable, that I need say no more about it.

But nothing can be more expres's to this purpose, than the Oath of Supremacy enacted by Queen *Elizabeth*, in the beginning of her long Reign, and from that time always taken, and at length made a part of the Test (*a*) in K. *Charles* IId's. time, and so continued till the late Revolution. So that a very great Part of the Nation, and especially of the Nobility and Gentry, together with all the Clergy, for divers succes'sive Reigns have actually and solemnly attes'ted the truth hereof, many of whom are yet living, that have taken it in these Words; (*b*) *I do utterly tes'tify and declare in my Conscience, that the Queen's Highnes's is the only Supreme Governor of this Realm, and of all other Her Highnes's Dominions and Countries.* Here the Queen was not only acknowledged to be the *Governor*, and to whom therefore the Subjects Obedience was due, but the *Supreme Governor*, and consequently unaccountable to, and irresis'tible by her Subjects; and *the only Supreme Governor*, and so that she had no Co-ordinate Power to partake of that Supremacy, and was not only *Major singulis*, but *universis* too. And in the first Statute of the 5th of the Queen it was farther enacted, that *Every Person which shall hereafter be elected or appointed a Knight, Citizen, or Burges's, or Baron of any of the Five Ports, for any Parliament or Parliaments hereafter to be holden, shall from henceforth, before he shall enter into the Parliament-House, or have any Voice there, openly receive and pronounce the said Oath, before the Lord-Steward for the time being, or his Deputy, or Deputies for that time to be appointed. And he which shall enter into the Parliament-House, without taking the said Oath, shall be deemed no Knight, Citizen, or Burges's for that Parliament, --- but*

(*a*) 25. Car. II. c. 2. (*b*) 1. Eliz. c. 1. 19.

--- *but shall be to all intents and purposes, as if he had never been returned or elected.* And though this Oath hath been thought fit to be omitted since the Revolution, the Supremacy asserted by these Statutes has never been contradicted by any later Acts, nor any thing ever pretended to prove this an unlawful Oath, and the Sovereignty asserted by it disagreeable to the Nature of our English Constitution. And I am very sure all we who have been required by Law to Swear it over and over, must be inexcusable to the last degree, if to please any Party, or serve any present Turn, we should in defiance to the Doctrin of the Laws, and our own Oaths deliberately taken thereupon, deny what we have thus reasonably, truly and legally avowed upon our Consciences and Oaths. Mr. *H.* probably may never have taken that Oath, but since he knows Multitudes of others have, and as directed and required by Law, he must needs know that this Supremacy is a necessary, essential Part of our Constitution; and to deny it, is to contradict the positive Doctrin of the Statutes that have enjoined it. Which being once granted, the Inference made by the Author of the *Royal Apology* must take place, (*h*) *That if the King is Supreme, then he hath no Superiour; if only Supreme, then no equal: If over all Persons, --- then all Persons in these his Realms, and all other his Dominions and Countries, are subordinate or subject to him; and if subordinate, then none of them either severally or jointly are coordinate with him*; I add, or any way intituled to act as his Superiours, and call him to account, or forcibly to proceed against him for his Maladministration.

And that the King is owned to be thus Supreme by the Common Law, is abundantly shewn by Mr. *Sheringham*, in his Learned Discourse entituled, *The King's Supremacy asserted*; and especially in the fourth and fifth Chapters.

I conclude this Argument therefore in the Words of the judicious Bishop *Sanderson*, (*i*) *To us of this Nation, it*

(*h*) P. 8.

(*i*) *Pref. to A. Bp.* Usher's *Power of the Prince.* n. 16.

it is so evident where it [the Supremacy] *resideth, that we needed not have recourse to Statesmen and Lawyers, for Information in that Point. The known Laws of the Land have declared it so fully, and particularly the Oath of Supremacy expressed it so clearly, that any Man of ordinary capacity may understand it, as well as the deepest Statesman in the World.*

2. All Allegiance is constantly owned to be due to the King, and to him only: To him we have been all along required to promise and swear it, and never to the People, either Collectively or Representatively. *Ligeance*, says the Lord Chief Justice *Coke*, (*k*) *is a true and faithful Obedience of the Subject due to his Sovereign, and is an incident inseparable to every Subject; for as soon as he is born, he oweth by Birthright Liegeance and Obedience to his Sovereign.* Consonantly whereto says *Cowel*, (*l*) *Liege* (Ligius) *is a Word borrowed from the Feudists, and has two several Significations in our Common Law; sometimes being used for Liege Lord, and sometimes for Liege Man. Liege Lord is he that acknowledgeth no Superiour, Liege Man is he that oweth Ligeancie to his Lord.* And the Statute-Book speaks nothing more plainly, than that Allegiance is due, and of right belongs to our Sovereign Lord the King. In the 11th Year of *Richard* II. (*m*) *All the Lords, Bishops and Commons were openly Sworn in Parliament, --- saving their Allegiance to the King, and their due Obedience to his Prerogative and Laws.* And Mr. *Sheringham* tells us, (*n*) that in the Acts of Parliament, *The King is called the* Liege Lord *of his Subjects, and the Subjects are called the King's* Liege People. In 26th *Hen.* VIII. *Ch.* 2. this Oath was required to be taken *by all and singular the King's Subjects, as well the Nobles Spiritual and Temporal, as others: Ye shall swere to bear Faith, Truth, and Obedience, all onely to the King's Majesty, to his Heirs, ---- and not to any others.* —— And long

(*k*) Calvin's *Case. Rep. To.* 7. *p.* 4.
(*l*) *Interpreter*; *in the Word* Liege.
(*m*) Cotton's *Abridgment of the Tower-Records.* p. 322.
(*n*) *The King's Supremacy asserted.* ch 3. p. 17.

long before this, in the *Saxon*-Times, King *Arthur*, and ~~and~~ after him *Edward* the Confeſſor, (*n*) require it to be taken at the *Folkmote* every Year in the beginning of *May*. Such was the Oath that was wont to be taken at the Court-Leet. And this *Ligeancie*, or Allegiance, was Sworn to the King, ſays *Coke*, (*o*) *to the Natural Perſon of the King, and was not due to the Politick Capacity only.* And again, (*p*) that it was *proprium quarto modo*, to the King; *omni, ſoli, & ſemper. And oftentimes in the Reports of our Book-Caſes, and in Acts of Parliament alſo, the Crown or Kingdom is taken for the King himſelf.* But nothing can poſſibly be more home to my Purpoſe, than the Declaration of all the Three Eſtates in the firſt of *James* I. binding themſelves and their Poſterity to him and his Heirs for ever; and the Oath of Supremacy by Queen *Elizabeth*, recited under the former Head; and that Oath of this ſame King *James*, wherein we ſware, *to bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majeſty, his Heirs and Succeſſors, and him and them to defend to the utmoſt of our Power, againſt all Conſpiracies and Attempts whatſoever.* Both which Oaths were alſo made a part of the Teſt: 25. *Car.* II. *c.* 2. Whence it can be no longer doubted, to whom an *Engliſh* Subject's Allegiance is entirely and ſolely due, and conſequently whom he is never to reſiſt, till Allegiance and Reſiſtance can be proved to be the ſame thing, or at leaſt to be clearly agreeable and conſiſtent with each other.

3. Another irrefragable Argument for proving the Illegality of all Reſiſtance by the *Engliſh* Conſtitution, is, that the Power of the *Militia* is by Law declared to be ſolely in the King. For every Sovereign as ſuch, is naturally, and our own Sovereign in particular, is declared to be the Fountain of all Military, as well as Civil Power. And as no Man may take upon him, to act as a Judge, or Juſtice of the Peace, or but as a Petty Conſtable, without an Authority derived from his Prince;

(*n*) Leg. Edovardi Regis. 35. apud Lamb. de priſcis Anglorum legibus. *p.* 146.
(*o*) Calvin's *Caſe*. p. 10.
(*p*) P. 12.

Prince; so neither may any take the Sword, or thrust himself into a Military Office, without a Commission from him, or at least the Appointment of somebody thus Commissioned. And whosoever shall venture to do so, must expect the Consequence of such an Attempt to fall heavy upon him, so long as the Laws may be permitted to have their Course, and not be silenced by the Power of the Sword. God has placed the Sword, no less than the Scepter, in the Sovereign's hand, and given him Authority to use it, and to none else within his Dominions, but who take it up for his Service, and by Order from him. So says *Fleta*, (q) *The King hath in his hand all the Rights of the Crown and Temporal Jurisdiction, and the Power of the Sword, as necessary for the Government of the Kingdom.* And so says the Statute-Book, nothing being more evidently against Raising any sort of War against the King, than the (r) Statute of Treason. (s) The fourth Branch of which is, That it is Treason, *if a Man do levy War against the King in his Realm, or be adherent to the King's Enemy in his Realm, giving them Aid and Comfort in the Realm, or elsewhere.* This, if against a bad, a ruining destructive King, or even a King that does not continually attend to the end and design of his Office, is the very *Resistance* so earnestly pleaded for. And yet even such Resistance of the King, whosoever, or whatsoever he be, is here condemned under no less a Penalty than Forfeiture of Estate, Honour, and Life. And Sir *Edward Coke* upon

(q) Habet Rex in manu sua omnia jura quæ ad coronam & Laicalem pertinent potestatem, & materialem gladium qui pertinet ad regni gubernaculum. *l.* 1. *c.* 17.

(r) 25. Edw. III. Stat. 5. c. 2.

(s) *It is to be noted that this was only a restraining Act, and did not make any thing Treason that was not so before at the Common Law, but on the contrary reduced this heavy Charge into a less compass, making thenceforward many things not to be Treason, which the Common Law had arraigned as such. So that whatever is here branded for Treason, is Treason both by Statute and Common Law; and in particular to* Levy War against the King *is so.*

upon this Statute says, the same was Treason by the Common Law before; and that *if any levy War to expulse Strangers, to deliver Men out of Prisons, to remove Counsellors, against any Statute, or to any other End, without Warrant, this is levying War against the King; because they take upon them Royal Authority.* So that if we attend only to this one Statute and the Common Law, no Man can have a Commission to raise and list Soldiers, to train and muster them; or to be a Commander, or General, or Captain over them, but from the King. And no Man can ~~can~~ take any such Employment upon him without the King's Commission, whatever Benefit he design to the Society by it, but he endangers the loss of his Head. It is a well-known Story of Sir *Richard Walsh*, High Sherif of *Worcestershire* in King *James* the First's Days, that having pursued the Gunpowder-Traitors out of his County, though *dutifully* done, as the King himself bears him (*t*) witness; nevertheless he found it necessary to confess his Offence to the King, and obtain a Pardon for having carried his Forces beyond their proper Bounds, to do a very signal Service to his Majesty, only in an illegal way. So it has in like manner been observed of the Earl of (*u*) *Shrewsbury* in King *Henry* the Eighth's time, that having in a suddain Rebellion which then arose, raised Arms for suppressing it without the King's Commission, he thought himself obliged to procure his Majesty's Pardon, though he had happily succeeded in his Design, to the apparent Service of his King and Country.

But to put the Matter yet more out of doubt, in K. *Charles* the Second's time; when the Parliament first, and afterwards *CROMWELL* and his Party, had taken upon them to wage a rebellious War; the former against his Royal Father, whom they had barbarously murdered; in an inhuman manner, beyond the Example of former Ages; and the others against himself, keeping him from the Possession of his Throne, for many Years, together;

(*t*) *King* James's *Works*. p. 244.
(*u*) Holinshead's *Chronicles*, *in the Year* 1536.

gether; to prevent any such undutiful Designs for the future, it was formally and solemnly declared in full Parliament, (*u*) *That within all his Majesty's Realms and Dominions, the sole Supreme Government, Command and Disposition of the* Militia, *and of all Forces by Sea, and of all Forts and Places of Strength, is by the Laws of* England *and ever was the undoubted Right of his Majesty, and his Royal Predecessors, Kings and Queens of* England; *and that both, or either of the Houses of Parliament cannot, nor ought to pretend to the same; nor can, nor lawfully may raise or levy any War, Offensive or Defensive, against his Majesty, his Heirs or lawful Successors.* And by this Act it is also ordered, that *No Person whatsoever*, whether Peer of the Realm, or of Inferiour Rank, *shall be capable of acting as a Lieutenant, or a Deputy-Lieutenant, or other Officer or Soldier, till he shall have taken the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, according to the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom.* In which Oaths, they were to Swear, amongst other things, that they would *bear Faith and true Allegiance to the King's Highness, his Heirs and* LAWFUL *Successors; that they did acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare, in their Conscience, that their Sovereign Lord King* Charles *was* LAWFUL AND RIGHTFUL KING OF THIS REALM, *and of all other his Majesty's Dominions and Countries; that they would bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, and him and them would defend to the utmost of their Power, against all Conspiracies and Attempts whatsoever.* The same Oaths were likewise required to be taken (*x*) by all Mayors, Aldermen, and others concerned in the Government of Corporations and Burroughs, together with this following; *I declare and believe that it is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever to take up Arms against the King; and that I do abhor that Traiterous Position of taking Arms by his Authority against his Person, or against those that are commissioned by him; so help me God.* And by the *Act of Uniformity*, (*y*) All Ecclesiastical Persons, with divers others

(*u*) *The* Militia-*Act.* 13 Char. II. c. 6.
(*x*) 13. Car. II. c. 1. (*y*) 13 & 14. Car. II. c. 14.

others there particularly ſpecified, were to ſubſcribe to the Truth of that Aſſertion of the Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſtance upon *whatſoever* Pretence. And all Rectors, Vicars, and Curates, were to make the ſame Declaration in the publick Congregation. This Declaration was enjoined alſo to be made (z) by all Members of Select Veſtries. This was plainly and indiſputably the caſe before the Revolution. And though theſe Oaths and Declarations have for ſome Reaſons been thought fit ſince to be laid aſide, yet the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance has never been enacted. Nor does it by any means follow from hence, that all Reſiſtance is not ſtill as much condemned by our Laws as ever, though the Subjects are not expected to bear their Teſtimony againſt it as formerly. Nor would the Obligation of the Law ceaſe in this reſpect, though no Oaths or Declarations at all were impoſed upon either Clergy or Laity.

I know not what can be objected to theſe Statutes and Oaths, they are ſo full and clear againſt all Reſiſtance, leaving no room for it upon whatever Occaſion. Not only good Kings are here required to be ſubmitted to, and taught to have the Power of the Sword in their hand, but the King indefinitely, whoſoever he be, or howſoever qualified. The *Militia* is declared to be, and have been by Law, at the Diſpoſal and Command of the King and his Royal Predeceſſors, and that this was ſo undoubtedly their Right, that neither of the Houſes of Parliament, nor both of them together, may pretend to it. Nor can they lawfully raiſe or levy any War againſt the Crown. And though this of itſelf were abundantly enough, to ſilence all Pretences of the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance, upon whatever Account, yet ſtill to do it the more effectually, theſe Words are added; *Offenſive or Defenſive*, which including all ſorts of War againſt the Prince, make it evident, that all ſuch Wars are utterly unlawful. And the rather if it be conſidered that even a *Defenſive* War is here condemned; which ſuppoſes an Invaſion made upon the People, or

(z) 15. Car. II. c. 5.

their Rights, or at leaſt an imagination of ſuch a Deſign, without which there would be no temptation to Riſe for their own Defence. Wherefore a War made only for the Subjects own Defence, and by the pretended Authority of either or both Houſes of Parliament, or of the Body of the People either collectively or repreſentatively, being thus poſitively declared to be againſt Law, I am exceedingly at a loſs to find, what forcible Reſiſtance can poſſibly be according to Law. Beſides that there is another Act (*a*) *for ordering the Forces in the ſeveral Counties of England*, that begins in the ſame manner and almoſt in the very ſame Words with the *Militia*-Act, and ſo muſt inevitably teach the ſame Doctrine. As it does firſt, and then proceeds to enact, and declare, That *the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, his Heirs and Succeſſors, ſhall and may from time to time, as occaſion ſhall require, iſſue forth Commiſſions*, &c. So that in both theſe Statutes, it is obſervable that the King may give out what Commiſſions he pleaſes, for raiſing, training, and arming of Soldiers; and that this is, and always was, the peculiar Prerogative of the Prince, ſo as that none of his Subjects, not even the two Houſes of Parliament, may preſume to raiſe any Army againſt him, though for even a Defenſive War. Which in my opinion is no Proof of the Legality of Reſiſtance. And for this ſhort Reaſon, becauſe it is forbidden under the moſt favourable Circumſtances, when only by way of Defence againſt the Aſſaults of an unjuſt and tyrannical Sovereign. *Suppoſing it true, that Governors act contrary to the End of their Inſtitution, and invade the Rights of their Subjects, and attempt the Ruin of that Society over which they are placed*, yet theſe Laws are ſo far from declaring it *Lawful and Glorious for theſe Subjects to conſult the Happineſs of the Publick, and of their Poſterity after them, by oppoſing and reſiſting ſuch Governors*, that they utterly forbid all manner of forcible Oppoſition to them, as no way conſiſtent with their Duty, and leave the Ordering of all the Forces both by Sea and Land, purely to the King's

(*a*) 13 & 14. Car. II. c. 3.

King's Direction, not to the Will of any of his Subjects. This is full Proof, and such as cannot be got over.

Whereto I would also subjoin an Argument *ad hominem* in relation to the forementioned Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*. Which though not at present in use, yet it may be remembred, that not only the whole Clergy for a long time together, but the present Lords Archbishops, and very near all the Bishops, and a great part of the inferiour Clergy, now in being, have over and over taken these Oaths. And I hope Mr *H.* will not have so little deference for their Judgment, as to charge them all with having sworn, as well as declared, and subscribed, what they did not understand, or that what they thus swore, declared, and subscribed, was not true. And if it was true then, it must be so still, unless it can be shewn, that the Constitution is quite changed since in this respect, and the Resistance then condemned as unlawful, is now taught and established by some new Law; or at least that the Statutes then condemning it, have been all solemnly and effectually repealed; which is not yet so much as pretended. Nor must only King *Charles* IId's Statutes have been repealed to make way for Resistance, before it can be reconciled to Law, but (*a*) divers others of much

(*a*) *Besides the forementioned Statute of* Treasons, 25. Edw. III. c. 2. *in the 7th Year of* Edw. I. *Stat.* 30. die Octobris, *it was owned by the* Prelates, Earls, Barons, and the Commonalty of the Realm, that to the King it belonged, and to his royal Seigniory, straightly to defend Force of Armour, and all other Force, *&c. The famous Statute* 11. Hen. VII. c. 1. *begins thus*, The King our sovereign Lord calling to his remembrance, the Duty of Allegiance of his Subjects of this Realm, and that they by reason of the same are bound to serve their Prince and Sovereign Lord for the time being, in his Wars, for the Defence of him and the Land, *&c.* 2 & 3 Edw. VI. *c.* 2. Soldiers *are said* to owe their bounden Duties to the King's Highness. *And again*, 4 & 5. Phil. & Mar. c. 3. *proceeds upon it as a known Truth*, That heretofore Commandment hath been given by the King's and Queen's

ancienter date. For this was no new Authority then given the King, but what belonged to the Crown long before, and was expresly acknowledged to do so.

4. The next Proof of the Illegality of Resistance is, what I have already mentioned, that it is declared no less an Offence than High Treason. And I presume I may take it for granted, that the Law does not approve of, or recommend, much less enjoin any sort of Treason. In the third part of the Lord Chief Justice *Coke*'s Institutes, *fol.* 6. 2. it is related, that in the 43d Year of Q. *Elizabeth*, the Earl of *Essex*, and others, assembled a Body of Men, not to offer Violence to the Queen's Person, but only to remove some of her Council, and this was adjudged Treason. And to depose the King, or take him by force, to imprison him till he hath yielded to certain Demands, is Treason, says (*a*) Judge *Jenkyns*, and was adjudged accordingly in the Lord *Cobham*'s Case. And in the Act passed in the 5th of *Edw.* II. entituled *Exilium Hugonis de Spencer Patris, & Filii*, the first Article is, That *they had affirmed and published in writing, that Homage and Oath of Allegiance were due, more by reason of the Crown, than by reason of the Person of the King, and that if the King did not demean himself according to Reason, in the Exercise of his Government, his Subjects might remove him by force.* Exactly Mr. *H.*'s *Resistance in some cases!* Yet this the Lord Chief Justice *Coke* calls (*b*) *a damnable and damned Opinion*, and tells us moreover that it was condemned by another Act of Parliament, 1. *Edw.* III. *cap.* 1. Which one would think were Proof enough, what our Laws demand and expect from the Subjects in this case, and that they admit of no Resistance by force, in whatever Case, or upon whatever Account.

5. A

Queen's Majesties, and others the Progenitors of the Queen's Majesty, Kings of this Realm, to divers and sundry Persons, to muster their Majesties People, and Subjects of their Realm of *England*, and to levy a number of them for the Service of their Majesties and of this Realm, in their Wars, &c.

(*a*) Jenkins. rediv. *p.* 20.

(*b*) Calvin's *Case*. p. 11.

5. A farther Argument againſt the Legality of Reſiſtance is, that our Law declares againſt all Coercion of the Sovereign, as a practice no way conſiſtent with the nature of the *Engliſh* Conſtitution. *Satis ſufficit ei ad pœnam*, ſays *Bracton*, (*a*) as I have before obſerved; *It is Puniſhment enough for him, that God will be a Revenger of his Miſcarriages.* And there is no neceſſity therefore that any elſe, eſpecially any of his own Subjects, who are to obey, not to puniſh him, ſhould have the Power of doing it. And the learned Author of the *Harmony of Divinity and Law* obſerves, (*b*) That the very Notion of Sovereignty and Subjection implies, that the People *have no Power or Authority, but what they have from their Prince; and therefore they can of themſelves have no coercive Power or Authority over him, who is for that very reaſon their Sovereign, becauſe he hath coercive Power and Juriſdiction over them. Wherefore unleſs we can imagine this Contradiction, that we may be Subjects and Sovereigns at the ſame time, and both ſuperiour and inferiour to the ſame Prince, or that the ſame Sovereign Prince may be ſubject, to thoſe over whom he is Supreme, it muſt needs be acknowledged, that Subjects have no Authority to reſiſt their Sovereign, and that by conſequence to do ſo, would be an unlawful or unauthoritative Act.* Nor is this the Doctrine only of Reaſon, and of our Lawyers, but of the Statutes too, which are ſo plain and full as to put the matter out of queſtion with all unprejudiced Perſons. Particularly (*c*) *the Act of Attainder of ſeveral Perſons guilty of the horrid Murder of King CHARLES* I. the more certainly to prevent all manner of doubt, concerning the King's Irreſiſtibility, for all time coming, do in the moſt ſolemn and formal manner declare, That *by the undoubted and fundamental Laws of the Kingdom, neither the Peers of this Realm, nor the Commons, nor both together, in Parliament, or out of Parliament, nor the People collectively, or repreſentatively, nor any other Perſons whatſoever, ever had, have, hath, or ought to have, any coercive Power over the Perſons of the Kings of this Realm.*

(*a*) L. 1. c. 8. (*b*) P. 6. (*c*) 12. Car. II. c. 30.

It is not possible to forbid all Coercion in more expres's Words than these are; for if any part of the Nation had a Power of coercing the King, the two Houses of Parliament must undoubtedly have the fairest Pretence to it; but here we are taught that *neither the Peers of the Realm, nor the Commons, nor the People* howsoever considered, have any such Power over their Sovereign, nor ever had by the Constitution of this Kingdom. And this is noted by a learned Person, (*a*) and well acquainted with the Laws, to be no alteration of the Constitution, but only declarative of what was originally so. Who tells us moreover very rightly, that the true foundation of that Axiom, *the King can do no Wrong*, is this, that *there is no Right or Remedy against his Royal Person.* Now this Statute is such an expres's Attestation against all Violence to be offered at any time to the King, as not only needs nothing farther to explain it, but that it cannot possibly be explained in fuller and more significant Words, than those of the Statute itself. For here is shewn what always was, as well as what shall be for the future, what has been always looked upon *as the undoubted and fundamental* Constitution of our Government, and what is for all succeeding Generations to be looked upon as such; namely, that whilst the Laws are suffered to have their course, and People will be guided by them, the Kings of this Nation, as they have hitherto been, so must they still remain exempt from all Coercion, either from their own Subjects, or any others whatsoever. And if this can be reconciled to the Doctrine of Resisting them, we need not despair of S. *Paul*'s being proved to plead for it too, *Rom.* 13. 1, 2. where it is as evident as Words can make it, that he condemns it under the most dreadful Penalty that can be; or to make any other part either of the Divine, or Humane Laws, stoop to whatsoever Sense we please, though in the most direct Contradiction that can be, to the natural and genuine Meaning of the Words. 6. And

(*a*) *Dr.* Kennet *Dean of* Peterburgh *in his Sermon before the House of Commons*, Jan. 30. 1705-6.

6. And *laſtly*, there is no taking Arms againſt the King without endangering his Life, if he ſhould come to a Battle; which is certainly in conſtruction of Law, conſpiring or imagining the Death of the King. And this not only the Lord Chief Juſtice (*a*) *Hale*, but all Lawyers without diſpute, own to be Treaſon by our Law; and all Judges hold themſelves bound to proceed againſt ſuch who are concerned in it as Traytors. And the Law is the ſame in this point, whether the King be good or bad, and muſt be allowed to ſtand ſo, till the contrary can be made out by as good Law, as any that are brought to the contrary; and particularly as (*b*) the Statute of Treaſons, which puts it in the Front of the ſeveral Branches of this heinous and dangerous Crime, and allots to it the heavieſt Penalties our Law inflicts in any caſe.

The Sum is, that as God's Law forbids all Reſiſtance of the Higher Powers, though ſuch as a *Claudius*, or a *Nero*, ſo our own National Laws declare the King, without diſtinction of Good or Bad, to be the only Supreme Governor of theſe Lands; that he has an undoubted Right to our Allegiance; and the *Militia* and the Power of the Sword belongs to him alone; and it is no leſs than Treaſon to uſurp it without his Commiſſion; as alſo that there is no Right of Coercion over the Kings of this Realm; and even imagining the King's Death, which every one is conſtrued to do, that takes up Arms againſt him, makes the Perſon ſo imagining a Traytor, and liable to all the Penalties of Treaſon. And if this be not enough to prove the Illegality of all Reſiſtance by force of Arms, according to the Tenour of our Laws, and the Nature of our Conſtitution, nothing in the World ever was, or can be proved. Here is ſuch a legal Eſtabliſhment of Paſſive Obedience, as makes it the indiſpenſable Duty of every *Engliſh* Subject, who would act agreeably to the Laws, not only of God, but of the Land. And how a Man can

(*a*) *Pleas of the Crown, in the Chapter of High-Treaſon.*
(*b*) 25. Edw. III. *Stat.* 5. *c.* 2.

can with a good Conſcience break through ſo invincible a Reſtraint, Mr. *H.* may pleaſe to ſhew when he ſhall be able. But then he muſt do it by much better, and more ſolid and ſubſtantial Anſwers, than thoſe we have yet ſeen.

He pretends indeed to have vindicated his Doctrine in point of Law; but ſo weakly and in ſo lame a manner, that I cannot conceive how he could either ſatisfy himſelf, or expect others to be ſatisfied with ſuch ſlight Pretences.

1. *I deſire*, ſays he, (*a*) *it may be conſidered, that I was to act the part of a Divine, and not of a Lawyer,* —— *and if there ſhould be any thing in Human Laws contrary to what I have taught, this will not prove the falſhood of it.* This I confeſs is ſtoutly affirmed; but it is not Affirmations we want, but good ſolid Proof of the Truth of them. For if this Doctrine of Reſiſtance could be ſuppoſed not to *contradict natural and revealed Religion*, it would by no means follow from hence, that it might not be reſtrained by Human Laws. For theſe have an undoubted Power of binding our Liberty in divers reſpects, and making that neceſſary, which of itſelf is not ſo. It is neither contrary to Natural, nor Revealed Religion, for a Man who is not free of the City of *London* to ſet up his Trade there, nor for a Miniſter of the Goſpel to Baptize without the Sign of the Croſs, nor for a Magiſtrate to enter upon his Office without a previous Oath for the faithful Diſcharge of it. But when the Laws of Church or State have ordered theſe, or other like Qualifications or Actions, as neceſſary for all that would engage in ſuch an undertaking, it will never vacate thoſe Laws, or take off their Obligation, to ſay the contrary Practice does not contradict either Natural or Revealed Religion. But if all Reſiſtance of the *Higher Powers* is forbidden by Religion upon pain of *Damnation*, as every one that does not wilfully ſhut his Eyes muſt ſee it is; and if our Laws apparently place the Sovereignty in the Prince, and make him irreſiſtible, as

(*a*) *Meaſures of Submiſſion*, p. 112.

as the foregoing Considerations fully prove, this will irrefragably evince *the Falshood of what Mr.* H. *has taught*, and will shew all Resistance here amongst us to be utterly unlawful, and that he is as much out in his Divinity, whilst he preaches it up and defends it, as he is in his Law; that is to say, he has grosly failed in both.

2. He next tells us, *It is absurd to expect there should be expreß Provision made in the Law, for all great and extraordinary Occasions.* But it is certainly much more absurd, to interpret the Law to a quite different Sense, from what the Words naturally and necessarily import, and to maintain that, when it over and over forbids all Resistance, without any manner of Exception, and under the severest Penalties, it must yet be understood to mean only in Cases of less Importance; and that if the Danger increase, and the Temptation grows strong, the Law must not be supposed to interfere with the Directions of Flesh and Blood, but Men may break through all the strictest Obligations it lays upon them, and so may be both Traytors, and good Subjects at the same time, and both for acting against Law. Traytors they must be, because the Laws make all Resistance Treason; and good Subjects, because Mr. *H.* will not allow Provision to be made in the Law for great and extraordinary Occasions. And this notwithstanding the Laws have, as positively as may be, forbidden all Resistance, all Coercion, all Attempts against the Prince in any case, and even a Defensive War.

3. *But*, says Mr. *H. it is much more absurd to imagine, that the Law can consent to its own Ruin and Destruction.* And this I take to be a very good Argument, against its allowance of Resistance in any case, there being no readier way for overturning the Law than that is. *Inter arma silent Leges*, is a Maxim grounded on long Experience. And it is easy to conceive that they, who have first broken their way through the Laws to take up Arms, will not be more observant of them, when they have those Arms in their Hands. Possibly Mr. *H.* may be of opinion, that Rapine, and Plunder, and Murder, and Rebellion, and all the other Wickednesses

that

that usually attend *the Resistance he has taught*, are more for the Preservation of the Laws, than a quiet, submissive, and conscientious Observance of them. But he has no Authority to impose the like Belief upon others, who desire to judge impartially, and be guided by their own best Reasonings, and not by the Dictates of his Fancy.

4. *It is I think*, says Mr. *H. agreed on by all Casuists, that no Human Law can oblige the Conscience, which manifestly contradicts the Publick Good.* This Plea of *Publick Good* I have particularly considered in the former part of this Discourse, and shall not trouble the Reader with a needless Repetition. But yet some farther Considerations it may not be amiss to add in this place, because I find it so much insisted upon.

1 Wherefore in the first place I would ask, Whether the Laws or Mr. *H.*'s Opinion be the best Standard of the *Publick Good?* These were made upon a consideration of the Mischiefs his Method of securing the Publick had brought upon it; and were designed to prevent the like destructive Courses for the future. And I should think myself highly to blame, if I should take upon me to say, they are not to be understood in that Sense, to which the Words most naturally direct, and which most exactly answers the End of the Legislators in enacting them, but must be interpreted to a quite contrary purpose, because what some Men falsly call the *Publick Good* is necessarily to over-rule them. Which is a Pretence, that is not only made to serve as a Plea for all the Treasons and Rebellions that ever are acted, nothing being more usual, than for the Ringleaders of such Wickedness to cry out with *Absalom*, though perhaps with no more truth than he did, (*a*) *See thy matters are good and right, but there is no man deputed of the King to hear thee: Oh that I were made Judge in the Land, that every man which hath any suit, or cause, might come unto me, and I would do him justice!* This Pretence I say, is not only made to serve as a Plea for all Treasons and

(*a*) 2 Sam. 15. 3, 4.

and Rebellions, but which is more to my prefent purpofe, is a clear acknowledgment that the Laws of the Land are againſt Reſiſtance, becauſe otherwiſe they would not need to be over-ruled in order to the *Publick Good*.

2. Whilſt the Laws are owned for the Standard of our Obedience and Submiſſion, we have a known Rule to walk by; but when theſe are over-ruled by a Pretence of *Publick Good*, we are immediately in a Wilderneſs, and know not which way to direct our courſe. Here the Paths are as various as Mens Fancies and Deſigns; and what one aſſuredly knows to be deſtructive of the Publick Welfare, another cries up with all the vehemence that may be, as the only way to make the Nation happy, and will treat you very roughly if you will not ſubmit all to his Deciſion, and theirs who are of his Party, and embarked in the ſame Deſigns with him. Which does not appear to me ſuch a bleſſed Change, as ſhould make all Men exceedingly in love with it.

3. For any thing I can ſee, this Pretence of *Publick Good* would plead to all Intents and Purpoſes as ſtrongly againſt an *Hereditary Government*, as againſt the unaccountableneſs of the Sovereign; and ſo ſtrikes at another Fundamental of our Conſtitution. And if a Man will hearken only to one ſide of the Queſtion, and magnify and elaborately harangue upon all the Advantages of his own Scheme, and either ſilently paſs by the contrary Miſchiefs of it, or perhaps ſet himſelf with all his Skill to palliate and leſſen them to a great degree, whilſt the other are embelliſhed with all the Ornaments of Rhetorick and Oratory, he may argue at leaſt as plauſibly for an *Elective Kingdom*, as for *Reſiſtance in ſome caſes*. He may plead that it is not fit the Crown ſhould ever fall to a *Minor*, who not being capable of managing his own Affairs, nor entruſted by Law with thoſe of the meaneſt Subject, ought therefore by no means to have any concern in thoſe of a whole Kingdom. For how can the People expect to be governed in this caſe? And what intolerable Miſchiefs, what almoſt inevitable Deſtruction muſt they be expoſed

ſed to? Or if he is not a *Minor*, but is however a Perſon of weak Underſtanding, and perhaps of an inflexible Obſtinacy with it, as too commonly happens, what a condition muſt his Subjects be in? And do not they deſervedly ſuffer all the Evils that ſhall befal them, if they will be content to let ſuch an one take the Reins of Government into his hands? Or again, the Caſe may be yet worſe, if they have one who is ſet upon doing all the Miſchief he can in his private Capacity, and cannot therefore be thought likely to be a tolerable Governor of the Society; indeed from whom nothing can be looked for but Folly and Wickedneſs, Cruelty and Oppreſſion, and an unbounded Tyranny? Yet ſuch muſt be expected to ſucceed ſometimes in Hereditary Kingdoms. Wherefore were it not abundantly better, in all reſpects, for the People to chooſe ſome one from amongſt themſelves, whom by long Experience they have known to be a Perſon of Prudence, Conduct, Judgment, Temper, Piety, Diligence, Sagacity, Integrity, and all other Qualifications neceſſary for that high Office; one that underſtands the nature of his Undertaking, and will not only apply himſelf to it uprightly and indefatigably, but will be able to promote the Happineſs and Welfare of the People to the utmoſt advantage? Such a Sovereign would be an Honour, an Ornament to his Kingdom; and under his *Shadow* and wiſe Adminiſtration, they might *live* and flouriſh *amongſt the Nations*. This were a plauſible Inſinuation, and likely enough to take with ſuch as had not well conſidered the dire Conſequences that frequently attend ſuch Elections. But whoſoever ſeriouſly obſerves the divers Evils and Inconveniences to which an Elective Kingdom is liable beyond what uſually attend an Hereditary Monarchy, and particularly ſhall take a view of *Poland* at this time, and *Hungary* too, if he pleaſes, may ſoon be convinced how little reaſon there is to wiſh for ſuch a Change. Yet Mr. *H.*'s way of ſetting up the *Publick Good* againſt the Laws, may by others be urged, as I ſaid, no leſs plauſibly againſt an Hereditary Government, ſuch as ours has always been

owned to be. So a Man may argue that a Popular Government is to be preferred before Monarchy, and seem to have some Reason on his side, whilst he insists only on its Advantages, without turning his eye to the much greater, that are certainly on the other side. Which yet upon an impartial view would quickly turn the scale, and shew these Pretences to be of no consideration in comparison of the vast Disadvantages whereto they are liable; besides that they are contrary to our Laws, and the Nature of our Constitution. The truth is, *Publick Good* is what every one is pleased to make it, and easily twisted and turned to serve whatever Purposes a popular Orator shall think proper to apply it to. But if seriously and throughly considered, must stoop to the Laws and Constitution, and is best promoted by a constant and regular observance of what they direct, provided they be such as are no way inconsistent with the Laws of God.

4. I find in Mr. *H.*'s Preface, *p.* xxvi. it had been *objected by some*, that when we speak of *Publick Good*, *we must consider what is the Good, not of one Particular Kingdom, but what is the Good of Human Society or the World in general.* And no doubt the Good of the Whole, is to be preferred before that of any of its Members. We have an odd Maxim in our Law, but which has more of Reason in it, than perhaps may at first be imagined, *Better a Mischief than an Inconvenience.* The Meaning is, that a Particular Mischief, which though heavy where it falls, is yet rarely felt, is rather to be born with, than a far less, but more general Inconvenience, and which may be expected to happen frequently. And the reasonableness of this Rule is attested by daily Experience. Now what single Persons are to a whole Community, that particular Communities are to the whole World. And no cause therefore can be assigned, why the same Doctrine should not by parity of Reason hold there too: that is to say, why Non-resistance, if for the Good of the Whole, should not be enjoined and practised, though it were supposed, as I cannot suppose it, *not* to be for the Good of any particular Society. This

Mr.

Mr. *H.* undertakes to anſwer; but I would beg of him to look over his Preface again, and ſee whether he really thinks he has anſwered it. He tells us firſt, *Whatſoever is for the Good of this Nation in particular, is for the Good of every Nation under the Sun, in all parallel caſes.* Which is a quitting the Queſtion he was to anſwer, and ſtarting another in its ſtead. A ſmall Fault (*a*) with Mr. *H.* The Objection was with reſpect to the World in general; and he ſpeaks only of particular Nations. And though he ſays *every Nation under the Sun*, he clearly ſpeaks of each Nation as it is in itſelf, not as conſidered in relation to the Whole; to which it is only as a particular Perſon or Member is to that whole Nation. And many things may be for the Good of a ſingle Member, that may by no means be for the Good of the whole Body. As to have the Gout removed from the Foot, may be for the Good of the Foot. But for Mr. *H.* to ſay, if ſo, it will be for the Good of every gouty Foot under the Sun, will never prove that to repel it thence to the Stomach, or Head, can ever be for the Good of the Man whoſe Foot it is. And as a particular Member of a Society ought ſometimes to bear with Hardſhips, put upon him, for inſtance, in an erroneous Judgment given in any Court of Law or Equity, or other the like caſe, rather than make a diſturbance in the Nation, ſo may a particular People be under equal Obligation, to ſubmit to ſome Hardſhips and Inconveniences, rather than any way diſorder that larger Community of which themſelves are but a part. Mr. *H.* ſays farther, *If they who object this mean, that every particular Action of this Nation muſt be conſidered, not only with relation to this Kingdom, but alſo to the whole World, at this rate we muſt not make War, nor enter into any Alliances, though never ſo neceſſary for our own Intereſt, unleſs it be for the Intereſt of all other Kingdoms, and even of our Enemies themſelves.* Where it is plain he is got again from the Good of the Whole, to that of Particular Nations, conſidered as ſuch, and not in regard to the relation they bear to the Whole.

(*a*) *See the Finiſhing Stroke*, p. 169.

Whole. So that in both Anſwers he has ſaid nothing, in reſpect to the Good of the Whole as ſuch, though this be the only Point he was to have ſpoken to. In ſhort, it muſt needs be for the Good of the Whole, to have its ſeveral Members live as quietly and peaceably with each other, as may be. And by conſequence, to teach a ſubmiſſive and obedient Behaviour in each Nation, muſt be as much better with reſpect to the whole World, than to foment Jealouſies and Diſſatisfactions, and promote frequent Inſurrections and Rebellions, as it is, for the Good of any particular Nation, to have each Family *ſtudying to be quiet, and do their own buſineſs*, and live kindly and lovingly with one another, rather than that inſtead of thus promoting the Publick Happineſs, they ſhould be continually employed about their own inteſtine Animoſities and Quarrels.

5. Mr. *H.* proceeds, *Much leſs can any Law be of force, which takes away from a whole Nation of Men, the Right of Self-defence and Self-preſervation.* As if a Nation could not ſubſiſt without a liberty to deſtroy itſelf; the too common Effect of Reſiſtance. But perhaps Mr. *H.* is deeply in love with the *Poliſh* Government, and thinks that Nation a very happy People, and in a moſt effectual way to preſerve themſelves; and ſo a tempting Copy for all others to write after. Or as if a People were much ſafer in their own Protection, than when Suffering in Obedience to the Divine Will, and a Faithful Dependance upon Almighty God, and his Promiſe, That (*a*) *all things ſhall work together for the good of them that love him.*

6. *But yet he may venture to ſay, that it will be hard to produce any Paſſage out of the Laws, which takes away from this Nation all Liberty of Self-defence, in caſes in which it may be ſure of Ruin without it.* Where what he means by the Nation's being *ſure of Ruin, without the Liberty of Self-defence*, I do not rightly underſtand; nor how he comes ſo well acquainted with the Decrees of the Divine Providence, which he has ſo little to do with in all his

(*a*) Rom. 8. 28.

Scheme, as to foreknow when a Nation is ſure of Ruin without Reſiſtance. But this I am ſure of, that (*a*) *the Sufferings of this preſent time, not being worthy to be compared with the Glory that ſhall be revealed* hereafter, it is very ill Policy to make the Peace and Welfare of our preſent State the main End of our Deſigns, preferring this ſhort tranſitory Life, before the eternal Felicity of the other: Which yet every one does, who againſt the Laws both of God and Man, ſets up for that Reſiſtance, whereto the Apoſtle has ſo expreſly annexed *Damnation*. This I ſay, upon Suppoſition of this Reſiſtance being a ready way to make us happy here. But if it be likely to make us no happier a People, than it did our Fathers in the long Rebellion after --41, or than it does the *Poles* or *Hungarians* at preſent, I can ſee no reaſon, why any ſhould venture to be damned for ſuch a Deliverance, attended with theſe tempting Conſequences.

7. He tells us, (*b*) *It is the Opinion of many who are more verſed in our Law, than he can pretend to be, that there are many things in it, in favour of what he has advanced.* This is a very looſe ſort of Expreſſion, and if rightly conſidered, amounts to nothing at all. He does not tell us who theſe *many* are, nor what the *many things* he ſpeaks of, nor how far they *favour what he has advanced*. I readily yield it would be to the purpoſe, if he could produce any Law now in force in behalf of Reſiſtance, and would let us ſee in what part of the Statute-Book it is to be found. But alas! this is mere Deluſion, and groundleſs Pretence. For here is not ſo much as one Statute mentioned, not one Common-Law-Maxim cited, not one adjudged Caſe alledged; nor indeed one ſingle Lawyer that is ſo much as pretended to *favour* it. All that he has to plead for himſelf, is a Paſſage out of *Bracton*, which imports the King to be a Tyrant, or in his Phraſe *a Miniſter of the Devil*, when he throws aſide the Laws, and reſolves to Govern arbitrarily. And yet I have before ſhewn, that *Bracton*, notwithſtanding theſe hard

(*a*) Rom. 8. 18. (*b*) P. 113.

hard words, does not encourage to rise up against and depose such a Prince, but to leave him rather to the Judgment of Almighty God. Wherefore I appeal to the Reader: Can any thing in the World be more vain, than to triumph upon such a slight Occasion, and cry out as Mr. *H.* does, *I find I have the Old Law on my Side?* when as yet he has no Law of his Side; nor does so much as pretend to alledge any thing more, than the Saying of one anonymous Lawyer, till I gave him a Name, and this one who openly declares against all Resistance. But it is Mr. *H.*'s way, to take things for granted without Proof, and which never can be proved. And if he pleases, he has my free Consent to value himself upon it as excessively as he can. But *this* he says, this Expression of an ill Prince's being *the Minister of the Devil, doth as expresly take from Princes all Divine Authority, in all Instances of Injustice and Oppression, as any thing he has said can do.* But now if one were to ask two short Questions, I cannot but suspect there would be some difficulty in returning a Rational Answer to them. What Power had *Bracton* to take from Princes all Divine Authority? Who gave him this Power? Next, if he did reckon himself to have *taken all Divine Authority from them*, how came he to allow them to remain still irresistible? I cannot see any such great difficulty in conceiving a Prince to be at the same time *the Minister of God*, by reason of his Commission from him, and *the Minister of the Devil*, with respect to the Abuse of it. And if Mr. *H.* can prove any Inconsistency in this, it would be kind in him to clear it up, for the Instruction of myself, and others, who are not so sharp-sighted as to make any such Discovery. Till this be done, I must conclude the only Reason why he has not offered at any such Proof, is in truth because he knew it could not be proved; and that his Reader ought therefore to take his Word for it, and not put him upon a Task that would be sure to be too hard for him.

8. He urges farther, that *our Legislators have publickly appealed to the Original Contract, and argued from thence*

for the transferring their Allegiance. For my part, I do not presume to set up in opposition to Legislators, or the Acts passed by them. But my Business being only with Mr. *H.* I hope I may without offence take the liberty to enquire of him, where this *Original Contract* is to be found, and whether it be as express for Resistance, as the Statutes I have quoted are against it? With whom it was made? and When? and before what Witnesses? who was constituted Judge of the Breach of it? and Where the Records of it are to be consulted? *Idem est non esse, & non apparere.* Since no such Contract can be produced, common Reason will direct to look upon it as nothing: The talk of it may serve to amuse unthinking People, but it cannot possibly be of any use, so long as we know neither where to find it, nor what it is. For I can no way think myself bound to prefer an invisible Contract, before known and visible Statutes, especially to prefer it so far, as to venture my Eternal Salvation upon it.

9. He insists next upon the Repeal of a Declaration against *taking Arms against the King, upon any Pretence whatsoever*; and if he had thought fit, he might have added the Oaths too, so constantly taken from the times of Queen *Elizabeth*, and King *James* the First. Yet this amounts to no more, than that the People are not now required to bear that Testimony against Resistance, that they were formerly; and will never prove, that they ought not to believe it still as unlawful as ever, since none of the Laws that condemn it have ever been repealed, but stand in their full force and vigour.

10. But this is not all; for he adds, *It is manifest, that in all their late Proceedings, with respect to the Succession to our Crown, they have followed this Maxim, that the Publick Security is the Supreme Law.* Now if I should for once grant him this, I am not sensible of what Advantage it would prove to him, unless they had also enacted Resistance, as the only Means of Security, and repealed all the former Laws against it: Which not being done, we have incomparably better Grounds left us, to believe Resistance still contrary to the *English* Constitution,

tion, than he has to believe otherwiſe. This is and will be the Caſe, whilſt the Statutes ſtand as they yet do, condemning all Reſiſtance; without exception for any Circumſtances, or any Miſgovernment the Prince may be juſtly chargeable with.

Wherefore let any Perſon, not deſperately under the power of Prejudice, weigh what is here ſuggeſted, and ſee how poſitive our Laws and Lawyers are againſt all Reſiſtance; and it will be very ſurprizing, if after this he can perſwade himſelf, that that little Mr. *H.* has offered, to ſo little, very little purpoſe, can poſſibly paſs with him for a Proof of the Legality of it. The King's having none above him but GOD only, were enough to argue him accountable to none elſe. But when the Laws not only own and bear Teſtimony to his Sovereignty, but moreover declare the Power of the Sword to be his peculiar Prerogative, and make it Treaſon to levy any War againſt him, or any way coerce him, and eſpecially to imagin his Death and Deſtruction; to talk yet of the Lawfulneſs of Reſiſtance, only becauſe *Bracton*, who was himſelf againſt it, once calls an ill Prince the *Miniſter of the Devil*, or for any other of the ſlight Reaſons now mentioned, muſt neceſſarily denote too *heady a Zeal for an Hypotheſis*, and too little regard for plain and unbiaſs'd Truth. So that it ſtill remains undeniable, that all forcible Reſiſtance of the Prince is irreconcilable to, and deſtructive of the *Engliſh* Conſtitution, and the Laws are evidently againſt it. Which was the Fourth Thing I undertook to prove.

CHAP. V.

Whether a patient Submiſſion, and Non-reſiſtance, be not preferable to Reſiſtance upon divers Accounts?

ALL that remains, is in the laſt place to compare the Advantages of Reſiſtance and Non-reſiſtance; and ſee whether the latter is not to be preferred before the former, and upon what Ac-

counts. And this I presume will be very apparent, if I shall be able to make it out, that Non-resistance is

I. *More pleasing to Almighty* GOD.

II. *More becoming our Holy Profession.*

III. *A likelier Method of Preserving, and Propagating Religion.*

IV. *A surer Course of obtaining Eternal Happiness hereafter: And withal, is*

V. *Not attended with such dreadful Consequences at present, as the Generality of the World are apt to imagin.* These are such singular Advantages of Non-resistance, under whatsoever Circumstances, as must exceedingly recommend it, to all such as are sincerely desirous to please God here, or be for ever Happy with him in the highest Heavens hereafter. And yet that this is the true State of the Case, I think it no difficult matter to evince very clearly: For,

1. That Non-resistance is far more pleasing to Almighty GOD than the contrary, is manifest from the divers Injunctions of it we meet with in Scripture, and the terrible Vengeance threatned to the Refractary and Disobedient. It is not only more agreeable to the Meek and Passive Temper of Christianity, but is so necessary and essential a Part of it, that there is no deviating from it, without incurring GOD'S Wrath, possibly here in this World; but without a hearty and sincere Repentance, most certainly in the other. And indeed this is the proper Trial of our Obedience, when we suffer Injuries for Righteousness sake; when we see our selves in danger of having our Rights invaded by an Arbitrary and Tyrannical Prince, or perhaps already ravished from us. And to behave our selves Submissively and Dutifully in this Case, is the best Testimony we can give, that our Dependance is upon God, and that we are acted and governed by a Fear of His Holy NAME. This shews us heartily desirous to please him, when (c) *Non civium ardor prava jubentium,*
Non vultus instantis Tyranni
Mente quatit solidâ: When

(c) *Horat.* Carm. 3. Od. 3.

When neither the Violence of our Fellow-Subjects, nor the Menaces of an insulting Tyrant can affright us out of our Duty, and either make us comply with any Commands inconsistent with our Religion, or put us upon any undue Method for the Preservation either of our selves, or it: This is a Service highly acceptable to Almighty GOD, and such a Proof of our Fidelity, as he will be sure to take notice of, and for which we may justly expect to be plentifully rewarded by him. *This*, says the Apostle, (*d*) *is thank-worthy, if a man for conscience toward God, endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye take it patiently? But if when ye do well and suffer for it, ye shall take it patiently, this is acceptable with God:* This he takes a particular notice of, as well suiting with his Will and Word, and that Pattern our Lord has set us; *who*, as it follows in the next Verse, (*e*) *suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his Steps.* Nothing like this can be so much as pretended to have been any where in Scripture spoken, in favour of Resistance. And I cannot therefore but conclude it out of Question, whether of the two is more pleasing to Almighty GOD. Those who live at ease, and have nothing to complain of, want an Opportunity of giving full Proof of their Fidelity; and no wonder if they be not tempted to Resist, whilst Submission is for their present Advantage. But when we labour under strong Temptations to the contrary, and yet retain our Patience and Integrity, our Loyalty and Allegiance, then it is we rightly approve our selves to Almighty God. Hereby we in a particular manner shew ourselves the Followers of the meek and suffering *Jesus*, and entitle ourselves to the Blessedness he has condescended to promise to all such as suffer out of conscience of their Duty, and for Righteousness sake.

2. Non-resistance is more becoming our holy Profession: As every one must be sensible, who considers with himself how earnestly our Religion recommends

(*d*) 1 S. *Pet.* 19, 20. (*e*) *Vers.* 21.

Humility and Lowlineſs of Mind, Meekneſs and Peaceableneſs, and Selfdenial, and Contempt of the World, and a readineſs to part with all Temporal Advantages, rather than offend Almighty God. For hence it is eaſy to collect, whether ſuits beſt with the Temper and Genius of the Goſpel, a quiet, dutiful, and obedient; or an aſpiring, impatient, and revengeful Spirit, as that of Reſiſtance is. Chriſtianity, if duly entertained, and attended to, would naturally incline us all, to be *patient towards all Men*, bearing undeſerved Provocations with a Calmneſs and evenneſs of Mind, to be kind and courteous to ſuch as have wronged and injured us, and even to render them Good for their Evil. It preſcribes the ſofteſt and eaſieſt ways of Application towards our very Enemies; that we try to win upon them by Benignity and Kindneſs; *heaping Coals of Fire upon their Heads*, to melt them into a Reconciliation. Hence ſays our Saviour to his two Diſciples, S. *James* and S. *John*, when they would have *called for Fire from Heaven* upon the *Samaritans*; and alledged *Elias*'s Example for it; (*e*) *Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of.* As if our Saviour ſhould have ſaid, you conſider not what kind of Spirit ſpurs you on to this; not that which my Doctrin was intended to inſtil into you, a Spirit of Clemency, and Kindneſs, and Forgiveneſs. "The Courſe which you muſt take, ſays Dr. *Ham-*"*mond*, (*f*) is that of Sweetneſs and Perſwaſiveneſs. *Ye know not* "how oppoſite this Exterminating Spirit is "to the Deſign of my Coming, ſays Dr. *Whitby*. (*g*) Oppoſite indeed it is to the Nature of the Chriſtian Religion: Which is a ſuffering Religion, and promiſes peculiar Rewards to ſuch as can forgo their Earthly Security and Conveniences, their preſent Enjoyments and Poſſeſſions, and their deareſt Friends and Relations for their Saviour's ſake, as our Bleſſed Lord told S. *Peter* and his Fellow-Diſciples: S. *Matth.* 19. 27, 28. *Then anſwered Peter and ſaid unto him, behold we have forſaken all and followed thee; what ſhall we have there-*

(*e*) S. Luke 9. 55. (*f*) In loc. (*g*) In loc.

therefore? *And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you that ye who have* thus renounced all, and *followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* And again, in the next words, (*h*) *Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall inherit everlasting life.* And now can any thing in the World be more opposite to such a merciful, and meek, and suffering Religion; and to such vast Encouragement as is here given to those who submit to be *persecuted for Righteousness sake:* Can any thing in the World, I say, be more opposite to this, than to teach Men never to suffer Persecution, but when they find themselves unable to prevent or remove it, by standing upon their own Defence; but to take up Arms for their own Preservation, and to divest their Prince of all his Rights and Dominions, how large soever, and of all the Advantages that belong to his high Station, rather than suffer themselves to be deprived of their own lesser Estates or Privileges? *Defendenda religio est*, &c. says *Lactantius*, (*i*) *Religion is to be defended, not by killing others, but dying ourselves for it; not by Fierceness, but Patience; not by Wickedness, but by Faith.* —— *For if you will defend Religion by Blood, by Torments, by any thing that is evil, assure yourselves you do not defend, but pollute and defile it.* And it is reasonable to believe, that when our Saviour so often speaks of enduring Persecution, and even the loss of Life, and all for his sake, he cannot be thought to mean, that his Disciples might take up Arms against their lawful Sovereign, to avoid all manner of suffering by him: When he directs those who *are persecuted in one City*, (*k*) *to fly into another*; this does not look like an Instruction to them, to stand up for themselves there, rather than escape for their lives, and lose all they should leave behind them. In a word, search the whole Gospel, and every Chapter and Verse of it, and if throughout the whole

(*h*) V. 29. (*i*) Instit. l. 5. c. 20. (*k*) S. Mat. 10. 23.

whole there be no Encouragement for Resistance; but on the contrary, Patience, and Meekness, and Submission, and Suffering are frequently inculcated, and we are there from time to time commanded, (*l*) *to be subject to Principalities and Powers, and to obey Magistrates*; and this (*m*) *not* ~~are~~ *only for Wrath, but also for Conscience sake*; (*n*) to *submit ourselves to every Ordinance of Man for the* LORD's *sake; whether it be to the King as Supreme, or unto Governors, as unto those that are sent by him*; (*o*) *to honour the King*, &c. Who that reflects upon these Passages, can ever imagin Submission and Resistance to be both of them agreeable to the Nature and Design of Christianity? Who can reconcile Opposition to Authority to these Texts? But especially who, after this, can possibly perswade himself, that (*p*) *a Passive Non-resistance would appear upon Examination, to be a much greater Opposition to the Will of* GOD, *than the contrary?* It is as clear as the Sun, that to be submissive and obedient, not only to good and gentle Rulers, *but also to the froward* and perverse, to cruel and mercileſs Princes, resembles more the Carriage of our Blessed Lord, (*a*) *Who was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before the shearers is dumb, so opened he not his mouth*; than to be tumultuous, and self-willed, and resolve not to be conquered, were this to be prevented by whatsoever Means; that to suffer the loss of all in Obedience to our Lord's Command, gives a better Title to the Promises of the Gospel, than seeking the Preservation of whatsoever temporal Advantages, by a forcible Resistance; and again, that to forsake Enjoyments, or Relations, or whatever is most valuable here, for the sake of a good Conscience, and to avoid *Damnation*, is a much better Sign of our *conversation being in Heaven*, and that our *Affections are set on things Above, and not on things on the Earth*; than fighting, and contending, and breaking through the Laws both of GOD and Man to secure them, can possibly be.

And

(*l*) *Tit.* 3. 1. (*m*) Rom. 13. 5. (*n*) 1 *S.* Pet. 2. 13, 14.
(*o*) V. 17. (*p*) *Measures of Submission*, p. 8. (*a*) Acts 8. 32.

And as this shews us far more like our Blessed Saviour than the contrary, and more observant of his Commands; so is it more for the Honour of our Religion, which it sets forth in the greater Lustre: It lets the World see by our Practice, both how peaceable the Precepts of the Gospel are, and what Influence its Promises and Threatnings will be sure to have, upon those who duly attend to it; that it can raise its Professors above this World and all its Temptations, and can produce that happy Effect, which *Cæcilius*, in *Minutius Felix*, objects to the Christians of his time, as a Weakness in them, that (*b*) *The fear of dying hereafter, makes them not afraid to suffer Death at present.* It satisfies every body, how quiet, and how secure from all Treasons and Rebellions, each Nation would be, if the Doctrine of Religion had but got the Ascendent over Flesh and Blood; and that all the Seditious Insurrections in the World proceed from a want of Faith, and Trust in GOD, and Obedience to his Divine Laws. It would make it visible to all, what excellent Rules our Lord has prescribed us, and how greatly a due observance of them would tend to the Peace and Happiness of Mankind. *Nothing contributes more*, as the devout Bishop *Beveridge* speaks, (*a*) *to the Honour and Glory of God's great Name, than the Meekness, Patience, and Peaceableness of those who profess the Religion, that our Lord Christ hath established in the World; because it shews the great Power and Force that his Religion hath upon the Minds of Men, to keep their Passions in order, to make them loyal and submissive to their Prince, as well as just and charitable to one another. Whereas if they who call themselves Christians, should be heady and high-minded, Traytors and Rebels against their King, and disturb the Peace of the Country where they live, this would reflect mightily upon our Lord, as if he had established a Religion in the World, which turned all things upside down, whersoever it came. For ignorant and foolish Men, as the greatest part of Mankind are, will be apt to impute*

(*b*) Dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent. Min. Fel. p. 80. (*a*) Vol. X. Serm. 13. p. 415, 416.

impute all the Miſcarriages of thoſe who profeſs the Chriſtian Religion, to the Religion they profeſs. This is the reaſon that the Apoſtle here gives, why this Command ſhould be ſo religiouſly obſerved; For ſo, *ſaith he*, is the Will of God, that with well doing ye may put to ſilence the Ignorance of fooliſh Men; *that is, God is pleaſed ſtrictly to command you to* ſubmit yourſelves to every Ordinance of Man, *that ſo by this means you may ſtop the Mouths of thoſe who would otherwiſe upbraid you for a company of turbulent and factious People, and charge your Religion with being the cauſe of Riots and Tumults in the State, which would be a mighty Diſhonour to our Lord himſelf: And therefore you muſt needs be ſubject for his ſake.* Nothing gives a greater Blow to the Honour and Reputation of Religion, than the ill Lives of its Profeſſors; and as in other reſpects, ſo more particularly as to Diſobedience to Authority. And on the contrary, nothing tends more to its Credit and Advantage, than the careful and conſcientious Deportment of its Profeſſors, when *our Light ſhines ſo before Men, as that they ſeeing our good Works, may* hereby be induced *to glorify our Father which is in Heaven.* And thus it appears how much properer and more becoming our moſt holy Profeſſion a dutiful Non-reſiſtance is, than a contrary Oppoſition to, and Reſiſtance of the *Higher Powers.* It is likewiſe,

3. A likelier method of preſerving and propagating our Religion. The principal Plea for Reſiſtance of Authority is, the Security of the true Religion. And were it lawful upon any account to Reſiſt, it muſt be for this; becauſe of the mighty Concern Religion is of, to all that deſire everlaſting Happineſs, beyond all the tranſitory Enjoyments of this World. Yet even to preſerve our Religion we may not Reſiſt, this being neither a lawful, nor a probable way to preſerve it.

Having ſhewn the Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſtance upon whatever Accounts, it neceſſarily follows, that even the Preſervation of Religion cannot make it Lawful; and for this plain Reaſon, that this were only to do evil for a good End; and what a Character the Apoſtle ſets

upon

upon this every one knows. (*a*) *And not rather*, says the Apostle, *as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say, let us do evil, that good may come; whose Damnation is just.*

And as it is not a lawful, so neither is it a probable means of securing our Religion. For this Security depends upon the good Providence of God, who orders all things according to the good Pleasure of his own Will, and without whom no Success is to be expected. He may, and often doth permit Wickedness to prosper for a while; but this is more than can be any way depended upon. And in this particular Case, he many times, for wise and good Ends, suffers his Church and Faithful Servants to be under Affliction, and Tribulation, and lets their Enemies rage against them. Yet I believe every one will acknowledge, that the likeliest way to procure a Redress, is to please God, and not wilfully to offend him. And accordingly it is observable, that Religion always loses ground by Sin, but never by the patient and christian Sufferings of its Professors. This *Tertullian* insists upon as a truth, that their Persecutors ought to have attended to, it being a matter well deserving their serious Consideration, that all their Severities instead of lessening did but add to their Numbers. *Nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quæq; crudelitas, &c.* (*b*) Do *your worst*, as Mr. *Reeves* has very significantly translated this Passage, *Do your worst, and rack your Inventions for Tortures for Christians, 'tis all to no purpose; you do but attract the World, and make it fall the more in love with our Religion; the more you mow us down, the thicker we rise; the Christians Blood you spill, is like the Seed you sow, it springs from the Earth again, and fructifies the more.* So also says *Justin Martyr*, (*c*) Though *we be Beheaded, Crucified, exposed to the Beasts, to Bonds, and the Fire, and to all other sorts of Torture, it is nevertheless very apparent, that we not only depart not from our Profession of the Faith, but moreover by how much the more severely we are handled, so many the more faithful and devout Christians*

(*a*) Rom. 3.8. (*b*) Apol. c.50. (*c*) Dial. c. Tryph. *p.*337

Christians are there. And at another time, (*d*) *The Christians being daily punished, do yet abound the more.* And again, (*e*) *Do ye not see that so many more as there are employed to punish us, so much the more do our Numbers increase?* And to the same purpose speak (*f*) *Lactantius*, (*g*) *Gregory Nazianzen*, (*h*) S. *Jerome*, (*i*) S. *Austin* in divers places.

And no wonder a State of Persecution should have this happy effect, it being natural for those that suffer to a great degree, to meet with the Compassion of the Beholders, who are apt to have the more favourable Opinion wrought in them of the Doctrine they see thus wonderfully attested by the Tortures and Death of its Professors. And this tempts them to enquire into the nature of it, and try what secret Virtue they can discover in it, that should produce such a firm adherence to it, in defiance of all the utmost Barbarities that at any time are executed upon them. The Faith, and Patience, and other noble Virtues that so illustriously shine forth in those who follow our Saviour to the Death, are of singular Efficacy for disposing others to hearken to and embrace the Truths they suffer for. They must needs conclude these patient, and yet undaunted Sufferers to be

---

(*d*) Ep. ad Diognet. (*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Cum autem noster numerus semper Deorum cultoribus augeatur; nunquam vero, ne in ipsa quidem persecutione minuatur. *Instit. l. 5. c. 13.*

(*g*) Τοῖς παρὰ λαβεῖν διωγμοῖς —— οἱ πιωτέρω τ χρισιανισμὸν πεποίηκαν θᾶῆον ἢ ἀφανέσερον, ῥώσαντες τὰς ψυχὰς εἰς ὑπόβειαν, ϗ ὥσπερ σίδηρον θερμὸν ὕδατι τοῖς κινδύνοις σομώσαντες. Orat. 3. adv. Julian. p. 72.

(*h*) Persecutionibus crevit, martyriis coronata est, nempe Ecclesia. *Ep. 62. ad Theoph.*

(*i*) Ligabantur, includebantur, cædebantur, torquebantur, urebantur, laniabantur, trucidabantur, & multiplicabantur. *De civ. Dei.* l. 22. c. 6. Ad multiplicandam Ecclesiam valuit sanctus sanguis seminatione. *In Psal. 40. p. 247.* Multiplicati sunt magis magisq; Christiani, & non est impletum quod dixerunt inimici, quando morietur, & peribit nomen ejus? *ibid.* De sanguine occisorum tanti exsurrexerunt à quibus illi interfectores martyrum superarentur. *In Psal. 134.*

be fully perſuaded of the truth of what they are willing to ſeal with their deareſt Blood; becauſe otherwiſe it is not imaginable they would chooſe to endure all this Shame and Pain, rather than renounce their Profeſſion, and thereby ſet themſelves at liberty. And (*k*) this inclines them to think it may be their own trueſt Intereſt to take the ſame courſe, and venture to be ruined as to all that is dear in this World, rather than miſcarry everlaſtingly in the other. The Blood is one of the three Witneſſes that appear for Chriſt upon Earth, as (*l*) S. *John* tells us; and it has a very attracting power, and proves many times of great uſe for adding to the number of his Diſciples. Inſtead of affrighting People from the Faith, it has ordinarily a quite contrary Tendency, and makes them the more in love with it.

But it is much more conſiderable, that God Almighty is ready by his good Spirit to cheriſh and encourage any ſuch Beginnings, and make them effectual for *adding to the Church ſuch as ſhall be ſaved.* He knows very well how to over-rule all the Purpoſes and Thoughts of Men to his own Ends, though far beyond what they at firſt deſigned. And hence it comes to paſs that the Perſecuting of Chriſtianity, whilſt its Profeſſors ſubmit and ſuffer as he requires of them, becomes a means of its Propagation, and makes People more eager and vigorous in the Profeſſion of it. So that Religion itſelf is never like to be extirpated by Perſecution, unleſs its Profeſſors fail of performing their Duty as they ought, whilſt under theſe Tryals, or otherwiſe provoke God to deliver them up, by whatſoever Tranſgreſſion or Neglect of their Duty in other reſpects.

And as to the Privileges and outward Advantages attendant upon it, it is not ſo certain that theſe will ſuf-

fer

(*k*) Nec tamen deficiet hæc ſecta; quam tunc magis ædificari ſcias, cum cædi videtur. Quiſq; enim tantam tolerantiam ſpectans, ut aliquo ſcrupulo percuſſus, & inquirere accenditur, quid ſit in cauſa; & ubi cognoverit veritatem, & ipſe ſtatim ſequitur. *Tertull. ad Scap.* in fine.

(*l*) 1 Epiſt. 5. 8.

ſer much by them. For God has many ways to deſiver his Servants out of their Diſtreſs, and grant them Eaſe and Safety, when neither Themſelves nor their Perſecutors think of it. He has a watchful Eye over them, and oftentimes preſerves them by unforeſeen, and in all appearance improbable means. And this perhaps when upon the very point of Deſtruction.

Thus he delivered the *Jews* (*m*) in *Ahaſuerus*'s time, out of the very Jaws of Death, when the Day was ſet for their Extirpation, and the Orders for it already given; and all by means of poor *Mordecai*, whom one would have thought a very mean Inſtrument, for bringing about ſo wonderful an Eſcape.

At another time they were almoſt miraculouſly ſaved in the days of *Caligula*; (*n*) when upon repeated Orders to *Petronius*, whom he had ſent with an Army into *Judea*, to ſet up his Statue in the Temple, with commiſſion to ſlay ſuch as ſhould oppoſe it, and to take the reſt of the Nation Captives, yet in theſe uncomfortable Circumſtances they were however preſerved. Their humble Submiſſion and Prayers for the Emperor, together with their Readineſs to dye rather than either reſiſt their Sovereign, or violate their Law in compliance with his unjuſt Demands, wrought ſo powerfully upon *Petronius* that he forbare to put his Orders in execution, and ventured at the peril of his Life to entreat the Emperor's Mercy towards them. But this Clemency and Compaſſion in him gained them only a ſhort delay: For a ſevere and angry Anſwer was immediately diſpatch'd, threatening him with Death for having ſo long neglected to perform what was commanded. And now what hope of Reſcue remained for a People thus inexorably devoted to Deſtruction? They could not expect but *Petronius*, though very kind to them, would yet offer himſelf a Sacrifice for them.† Or if he had, they could hope for but a little reſpite by it, till ſome other General, leſs merciful than he, ſhould be ſent in his ſtead. Yet now in their loſt undone Condition, when no hope of

(*m*) Eſth. 4. 1, &c. (*n*) Joſep. Ἰουδ. ἀλωσ. l. 2. c. 10. & Antiq. l. 18. c. 11.

† Joſephus de Bello Judaico l. 2. c. 10. §. 6. ſaith that Petronius did offer to lay down his life for y^e Jews; ſaying, ἢ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ συνεργοῦντος πείσας Καίσαρα

of Safety was left, behold the wonderful Goodneſs of God to his faithful and ſubmiſſive People! The Courier that was to bring theſe deſtructive Orders, was fortunately ſtopt at Sea, till another arrived before him with the News of the Emperor's Death, and ſo put an end to this moſt execrable Deſign.

So *Lactantius* relates, (*o*) that when *Maximin* had vowed to *Jupiter*, utterly to extinguiſh the Chriſtian Name, if he obtained the Victory againſt them as he expected; upon *Licinius* and his Army's Prayer to God for Deliverance, *Maximin* with all his Forces, though incomparably more than the others, were preſently mowed down, like Men diſmayed and unable to help themſelves. His whole Army was killed and routed, and himſelf forced to fly in a mean Diſguiſe, to ſave his Life; and thoſe he had deſtined to Slaughter, were happily releaſed from all their Fears.

In like manner when *Julian* ſetting out upon his Expedition into *Perſia*, had determined, upon his return with the Victory and Triumph he had vainly promiſed himſelf, to fall ſeverely upon the Chriſtians, as *Theodoret* teſtifies, (*p*) and as the (*q*) *Centuriatores Magdeburgenſes* relate from *Oroſius*, had already commanded a Theatre to be built, wherein to expoſe the Biſhops, Monks, and all the holy Men of the place, to the Claws and Teeth of the mercileſs Beaſts, ſo that now they ſeemed to be in a deſperate State, had it not been for that good Providence of God, which they had reaſon to believe, would not fail them in their great Neceſſity; yet by his Mercy and Protection they were ſoon relieved, their Apoſtate Enemy being cut off in the Battle, and ſo never returning to ſatiate his Fury upon them.

And multitudes of other like Inſtances might be produced, to ſhew that it is not ſo eaſy a matter to diſcover, *when a Nation is ſure of being ruined without Reſiſtance:* Becauſe God Almighty has a conſtant regard for his faithful Servants, that put their Truſt in him, and frequently

S

(*o*) De mort. perſec. *c.* 46, 47.
(*p*) Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 3. *c.* 21. (*q*) Cent. 4. cap. 3. *p.* 69.

quently works out Deliverance for them by ſudden and unexpected means. So that it really is oftentimes neareſt to them, when they have the leaſt proſpect of it. And I ſhould always deſire, as for myſelf, ſo alſo for my Country and Relations, and all I wiſh well to, that they may be rather under the Divine Protection, than their own; as being fully aſſured this is the beſt, the only Safety they can promiſe themſelves, either for Themſelves, their Enjoyments, or their Religion.

4. Non-reſiſtance is a ſurer courſe for obtaining Eternal Happineſs hereafter. This is the natural Reſult of all I have ſo largely diſcourſed, concerning the Unlawfulneſs and infinite Danger of Reſiſtance. And it is what all Perſons are nearly concerned to lay ſeriouſly to heart, weighing well with themſelves how much the wiſeſt courſe it would be for them, *to lay up to themſelves Treaſures in Heaven*, though by parting with all here if called to it, rather than inſiſt upon the Maintenance and Preſervation of their Temporal Rights and Liberties, with any the leaſt danger of ruining themſelves by it in the other World. Were it a doubtful matter, whether Reſiſtance might be an impediment to our Eternal Welfare, the diſparity that is betwixt the Bliſs and Felicity of the other Life, and any thing that can be expected to be kept or got in this, is ſuch; and again the Tortures and Agonies of the Damned in Hell are ſo infinitely beyond what the moſt outrageous Tyrant can inflict here; that they ought by no means to be put in competition with each other. But if the caſe be ſo plain, as that in truth there is no room left for queſtioning, whether *Damnation* be denounced to all Reſiſters of the Higher Powers, who would be ſo intolerably regardleſs of his own everlaſting Salvation, as wilfully to incapacitate himſelf for it? As we are Chriſtians, we have *Life and Immortality brought to light by the Goſpel*, and ſo are ſure of being either infinitely Happy, or infinitely Miſerable for ever in a future State. And we muſt therefore be dreadful Enemies to our own Souls, if we will not be perſuaded upon occaſion to deny ourſelves ſome Temporal Conveniences, and undergo ſome

Hard-

Hardſhips and Difficulties, in purſuit of that never fail-ing Crown of Glory, which our Lord has promiſed to him that *overcometh* in his Spiritual Warfare. Heaven and eternal Happineſs are well worth all we can do or ſuffer in order thereto. And there is no Satisfaction on this ſide Heaven, comparable to that, of being able to to ſay with S. *Paul*, (*d*) *I have fought a good fight, I have finiſhed my courſe, I have kept the Faith, henceforth is laid up for me a Crown of Righteouſneſs, which God the righteous Judge, will give me at that day*, the laſt and great Day, when our Lord ſhall appear *to render to every man according to his doings*. This is the peculiar Advantage of a patient Submiſſion to God's Will, and Acquieſcence in whatſoever he thinks fit to lay upon us, whether by the Tyranny of an evil Governor, or any other way. And our Bleſſed Saviour tells us on the other hand, how ſad and doleful the caſe will be with ſuch as take a contrary courſe, namely, that they are not worthy of him, and by conſequence are ſure not to be owned and glorified by him hereafter. (*a*) *If any man come to me, and hateth not his Father and Mother, and Wife and Children, and Brethren and Siſters, yea and his own Life alſo, he cannot be my Diſciple: And whoſoever doth not bear his Croſs and come after me, cannot be my Diſciple.* And a little after, (*b*) *Whoſoever he be of you that forſaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my Diſciple.* And again, (*c*) *If any man will come after me, let him deny himſelf, and take up his Croſs, and follow me: For whoſoever will ſave his life ſhall loſe it, and whoſoever will loſe his life for my ſake ſhall find it.* Of ſuch unconceivable and infinite Concern is it to us, to ſlight, and undervalue, and be ready to be ſtript of all temporal and worldly Advantages and Enjoyments, rather than uſe any unlawful means for preſerving them. And for our Encouragement it may be farther remembred, and it is the laſt Conſideration I mentioned, that,

5. Non-reſiſtance is not attended with ſuch dreadful Conſequences at preſent, as the generality of the World

(*d*) 2 Tim. 4. 7, 8.
(*a*) *S.* Luke 14. 26, 27. (*b*) V. 33. (*c*) *S.* Mat. 16. 23, 24.

are apt to imagine; I mean in respect to our own selves. I have several times hinted, that I cannot think Resistance to be for the Benefit of the Publick, though I have studiously forborn to enter upon that Controversy, as reckoning it much more to my purpose to shew the Sin of Resisting, and the infinite Danger of it in relation to another Life. But besides this, it is worthy our Consideration, that Persecution for Religion and a good Conscience, and a Sense of Duty to Almighty God, and a Desire of being eternally Happy with him in Heaven, is not so insupportable a Burden, as it is wont to appear to such as have never tried it. I grant it is no easy matter to be divested of one's own Possessions, and all means of Subsistance for himself and his Family, to be forsaken by divers of his old, and perhaps most intimate Acquaintance, to be frequently alarmed with Fears and Dangers of some farther Severity, to be Imprisoned, Outlawed, and it may be put to Death, for not complying with the sinful Commands of a tyrannical Governor. But yet the good Christian meets with inestimable Supplies of Grace and Comfort under these Tryals, and can heartily rejoice to think that the greater his Sufferings are, so much the greater Recompence may he expect, if he but acquit himself aright under them. He knows they cannot possibly last long; and that if he has no other Release from them, yet at least the Grave, which we are sure is not at any considerable distance, will effectually put an end to them. (a) *There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary are at rest: There the prisoners rest together, they hear not the voice of the Oppressor; the small and great are there, and the servant is free from his master.* And when once the Christian Sufferer is lodged in this cold Apartment, his Hardships are all over, and nothing thenceforward to be met with, but the most transporting Felicity, Joy, Love, and Light, and Splendor, and Majesty, and the Eternal Enjoyment of God himself, and our Blessed Saviour and Redeemer, and the perpetual Society of all the holy Angels, *and the Spirits of Just Men*

(a) Job 3. 17, 18, 19.

Men made perfect, or whatever can contribute to make him unſpeakably, unconceivably, and infinitely happy for evermore.

And in the mean time, though his Circumſtances are ſtraight, and his Fortune much reduced, and himſelf hereby forced to take up with a different meaner ſort of Life than he had been formerly acquainted with, yet poſſibly he may not be ſtript of all; and ſo may enjoy himſelf with a great deal of Satisfaction in his narrower Lodgings, with his courſer Fare, and threadbare Cloaths; and can bleſs himſelf to think, that he has learned with S. *Paul*, (*b*) *both how to be abaſed, and how to abound; and every where, and in all things is inſtructed, both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to ſuffer need.* He finds ſome Advantages in his Retirement that he wanted before, and which therefore help to make it the more agreeable to him. He has himſelf and his time more at his own command, is not overburdened with Company, is not *envied by his Neighbours*, is out of the way of divers Temptations whereto a more publick Station is liable, is in leſs danger of being overfond of this preſent Life and World, and can ſo much the more willingly quit it whenſoever he ſhall be ſummoned hence. And theſe, and other the like Conſiderations, he will be ſure to improve to his own advantage, till by degrees he makes all his Loſſes or whatever Sufferings not only tolerable, but eaſy to him.

Or ſuppoſe him reduced to a lower State, ſo as to live upon the Charity of well-diſpoſed Chriſtians, and withal that this comes in but ſlowly, and ſo his Wants are very pinching; yet ſtill *his Heart is fixed, truſting in the Lord*, who he finds does not ſo forſake him in his Diſtreſs, but that he ſometimes meets with Compaſſion and Relief: And when he does, it is a ſingular pleaſure to him to obſerve the hand of God thus ſeaſonably *adminiſtring to his Neceſſities*, ſupplying his Wants, and lightning his Burden when he is moſt preſſed, and almoſt born down with it. An unexpected Kindneſs in ſuch Circumſtances, is an admirable Cordial to his tired

(*b*) Phil. 4. 12.

tired Spirits; and lets him experimentally see, how happy that Man is whose Hope is always in the Lord, and who has learned invincibly to depend upon him. And beyond all this, he feels the Assistances of God's good Spirit upholding him when most in danger of sinking; and enjoys such an inward Calm and Serenity of Mind, is so composed, satisfied, and has such an Affiance in God, and such *Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost*, as he would not exchange for all the World. And if he be called to suffer Death for the Name of Christ, or for a firm Adherence to his Duty in whatever respect, he can readily resign his Soul to God who gave it, in full assurance of an abundant Reward thenceforward to be conferred upon him, when *his light Affliction, which is but for a moment, shall have wrought out for him a far more exceeding, and eternal weight of Glory.* In his utmost Extremities, and the greatest Hardships he is at any time reduced to, he knows he has a Good GOD to rely upon, who will not totally cast him off, but will be with him, to bless and provide for him at present, and to crown him with eternal Felicity hereafter. Which is such an invaluable Privilege, as may well take off the Edge of the sharpest Trials that can possibly assault him, and will make him with the Apostles, (*a*) *more than Conqueror, through him that loveth him.*

Which whosoever duly observes, must needs be convinced, that Suffering upon a Good Account is a far easier Task than it is usually represented to be, and especially by such as have an aversion to it. If a Draught of it be taken only from the Inconveniences that attend it, its Slights and Contempt, its Poverty and Wants, its Racks and Gibbets, *&c.* so I confess it will have no pleasing Aspect; and no marvel if some be terrified out of their Duty by it, when appearing in this frightful Dress. But let them only turn the other Side of the Table, and consider the Assistances and Comforts that are to be expected under it; and especially that inestimable everlasting Felicity, which is promised by the Gospel to all that suffer for our Saviour's sake; and they will

(*a*) Rom. 8. 37.

will presently see cause to have a very different Notion of it: They will quickly be convinced, that the worst that can befal them here is tolerable now, and will make them incomparably happy at last. Whilst on the other hand, any unlawful means for shaking off the Yoak, and preventing these Trials, may possibly meet with a cross Event here; but are sure beyond all doubt to be atttended with an infinite Load of Misery in the World to come, for ever and ever.

CONCLUSION.

AND now to come to a Conclusion of the Whole: Having considered the Insufficiency of Mr. *H.*'s Arguments, in behalf of *the Resistance he has taught*, and ~~and~~ shewn that they by no means prove it Lawful, much less a Duty *Honourable and Glorious*; and having on the other hand evinced the Unlawfulness and Iniquity of it, and that it stands condemned by all the Tests we have whereby to judge of the Rectitude or Obliquity of any Action of this Nature; and lastly, that the contrary Duty is more pleasing to God, more becoming our Profession as Christians, a surer Method for the Preservation of our Religion, a readier Way to eternal Happiness, and a much easier Task in itself, than some are desirous to have it thought; it can be no difficult matter to determine, whether of these two Courses is to be chosen. Wherefore I submit it to every one's Judgment, whether it be not far more suitable to the Doctrine of our most holy Religion, and more becoming the Disciples of a crucified Saviour, and who profess to take up their Cross and follow him, in hope of an eternal Enjoyment of him in Heaven, and in the mean time to have their Conversation there, and *live by Faith, and not by Sense*; whether, I say, it be not abundantly more becoming such as thus profess themselves Disciples of the Cross, and to hope for their Reward in another Life, to bear with Trials and Persecutions, and hard and unjust Usage at any time from

from their Sovereign, than to take the Cause out of GOD's hand into their own, and thereby shew themselves the Followers of the Devil; whom our first *Homily against Rebellion* justly stiles, (*a*) *the First Author and Founder of Rebellion, and the grand Captain and Father of Rebels.* We are to remember that Patience and Submission, and a Resignation to the Divine Will, are not only more conducing to the Welfare and Happiness of this World, than the contrary boisterous and turbulent Passions, but they are of absolute Necessity in order to a better. And nothing can be more highly reasonable, than to prefer the invaluable and lasting Rewards of the other State, before the unsatisfactory, uncertain, transitory Enjoyments of this.

I shall shut up all, with the late learned Dean of S. *Paul*'s, Dr. *Sherlock*, in the same Words wherewith he concludes his *Case of Resistance* of the Supreme Powers. *If you believe there is a Hell for Rebels and Traytors, the Punishment of Resistance is infinitely greater, than all the Mischiefs which can befal you in Subjection to Princes, and a patient Suffering for Well-doing.* What shall it profit a Man, if he shall gain the whole World, and lose his own Soul? *Though an Universal Empire were the Reward of Rebellion, such a glorious Traitor who parts with his Soul for it, would have no reason to boast much of his Purchase. Let us then reverence the Divine Judgments, let us patiently submit to our Prince, though such should persecute and oppress us; and expect our Protection here from the Divine Providence, and our Reward in Heaven. Which is the same Encouragement to Non-resistance, which we have to the Practice of any other Virtue. Were the Advantages and Disadvantages of Resistance and Non-resistance in this World fairly estimated, it were much more eligible to submit, than to rebel against our Prince; but there can be no comparison between these two, when we take the other World into the Account. The last Judgment weighs down all other Considerations; and certainly Rebellion may well be said to be as the Sin of Witchcraft, when it so inchants Men, that they are resolved to be Rebels, though they be Damned for it.*

FINIS.

(*a*) P. 276.

A Catalogue of Books referred to in the two Parts of this Answer.

A.

ALteserra in Anastasium. *Par.* 1680.
B. Ambrosii Opera. *Col. Agrip.* 1616.
Ammianus Marcellinus. *Hamb.* 1609.
Bishop Andrews *on the Commandments.* Lond. 1641.
Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament by certain learned Divines, &c. Lond. 1657.
Answer to Dr. Sherlock's *Vindication of the Case of Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers.* Lond. 1692.
Tho. Aquinatis Summa Theologica. *Paris.* 1632.
Aristotelis Opera. *Lugd.* 1590.
——— De Rhetorica. *Lond.* 1619.
Arnobius adversus Gentes. *Lugd. Bat.* 1651.
S. Athanasii Opera. *Paris.* 1627.
Athenagoras. *Lut. Par.* 1615.
B. Augustini Opera. *Basil.* 1529.

B.

DR. Barrow's *Works.* Lond. 1687.
S. Basilii Magni Opera. *Paris.* 1637.
Bellarmini Disputationes. *Lut. Par.* 1620.
Bernard's Clavi trabales. *Lond.* 1661.
Beveregii Synodicon. *Oxon.* 1672.
——— *Private Thoughts upon Religion.* Lond. 1709.
———*Sermons*; *Vol.* X. Lond. 1710.
Theod. Beza in Novum Testamentum. *Gen.* 1588.
Bishop Bilson *of Christian Subjection.* Oxford, 1585.
Bishop Blackhall's *Answer to Mr.* Hoadly's *Letter.* Lond. 1709.

Mr. Blomer's *Sermon in K.* Hen. VII's *Chapel.* Lond. 1711.
Bochartı Phaleg. *Cadom.* 1651.
Bracton de Legibus & Consuetudinibus Angliæ. *Lond.* 1569.
Brady's *Introduction to the English History.* Lond. 1684.
Brown's *Subjects Sorrow.* Lond. 1711.
Budæi Commentarii Linguæ Græcæ. *Basil.* 1556.
Bishop Burnet's *Vindication of the Church and State of* Scotland. *Glasgow*, 1673.
——— *Subjection for Conscience sake, asserted in a Sermon at* Covent-Garden. *Lond.* 1679.
——— *Sermon preached at the Chapel of the* Rolls. Lond. 1684.
——— *Life of Sir* Matthew Hale. *Lond.* 1682.
——— *History of the Reformation.* Lond. 1681.
——— *Two Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of* Salisbury. *Lond.* 1710.
——— *Collection of Eighteen Papers.* Lond. 1689.

C.

Dr. Calamy's *Sermon before the Artillery-Company.* Lond. 1685.
Callimachus. *Ultraject.* 1697.
Jo. Calvini Institutiones. *Genev.* 1617.
Cambdeni Hist. Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ. *Lugd. Bat.* 1625.
Case of Allegiance to the King in Possession. Printed 1690.
Its Vindication. 1691.
Julii Capitolini Clodius Albinus. *Basil.* 1546.
Dr. Cave's *Primitive Christianity.* Lond. 1672.
——— Historia Literaria. *Lond.* 1688.
Centuriatores Magdeburgenses. *Basil.* 1624.
Chamberlain's *present State of* England. *In the* Savoy, 1676.
King CHARLES's *Works.* Lond. 1662.
M. T. Ciceronis Opera. *Basil.* 1534.
B. Chrysostomi Opera. *Etonæ*, 1613.
Lord Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion.* Oxford, 1702.
Clementis Alexandrini Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1641.

Sir

Sir E. Coke's *Reports*. Lond. 1670.
Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of* Great Britain. *Lond.* 1708.
Comenii Paræneſis, &c. *Amſterd.* 1661.
Cotelerii Patres Apoſtolici. *Lut. Par.* 1672.
Cotton's *Abridgment of the Tower-Records*. Lond. 1679.
Cowell's *Interpreter*. Lond. 1637.
B. Cypriani Opera. *Oxon.* 1682.
S. Cyrilli Alexandrini Opera. *Pariſ.* 1638.
S. Cyrilli Hieroſolymitani Opera. *Oxon.* 1703.

D.

D'Avenantii Determinationes. *Cantab.* 1634.
Defence of the Profeſſion which John *Lord Biſhop of* Chicheſter *made upon his Death-bed*. Lond. 1690.
Sir Dudley Diggs's *Unlawfulneſs of the Subjects taking up Arms*. Printed 1647.

E.

Lord Chancellor Elleſmere's *Speech touching the* Poſtnati. Lond. 1609.
Enquiry into the Liberty of the Subject. Lond. 1706.
S. Epiphanii Opera. *Colon.* 1682.
Eſtius in Epiſtolas. *Col. Agr.* 1631.
Eucherii Lugdunenſis Opera. *In Bibliotheca Patrum.* To. VI.
Euſebii Hiſt. Eccl. *Lut. Par.* 1541. & *Col. Agripp.* 1612.
Eutropius. In vitis Cæſarum. *Baſil.* 1546.
Examination of the Arguments drawn from Scripture and Reaſon, in Dr. Sherlock's *Caſe of Allegiance, and its Vindication*. Lond. 1691.
Exercitation concerning Uſurped Powers. Lond. 1650.

F.

FAlkner's *Chriſtian Loyalty*. Lond. 1679.
Fleta de Legibus Angliæ. *Lond.* 1647.
L. A. Flori Rerum Romanarum Epitome. *Lond.* 1692.
Fulk *on the Rhemiſh Teſtament*. Lond. 1601.

G.

THE *Good Old Cause, or Lying in Truth.* Lond. 1710.
Grail's *Three Sermons preached at* Norwich. *Lond.* 1685.
Gregorii Magni Opera. *Basil.* 1551.
Gregorii Nazianzeni Opera. *Paris.* 1630.
——————— In Julianum Invectivæ. *Etonæ.* 1610.
Gregorii Nysseni Opera. *Paris.* 1638.
H. Grotius de Jure Belli ac Pacis. *Amstelæd.* 1670.
——————— De Imperio summarum Potestatum circa Sacra. *Lut. Par.* 1647.
——————— Opera omnia Theologica. *Amstelæd.* 1679.
Bishop Grove's *Vindication of the Conforming Clergy, in answer to Mr.* Jenkins. *Lond.* 1676.

H.

GEorgii Hakewill Scutum Regium. *Lond.* 1612.
Sir Matthew Hale's *Pleas of the Crown.* Lond. 1678.
Hammond's *Works,* Lond. 1684.
Hesychii Lexicon. *Lugd. Bat. & Roterod.* 1668.
Dr. Hickes's *Jovian.* Lond. 1683.
——————— *Harmony of Divinity and Law.* Lond. 1684.
S. Hieronymi Opera. *Col. Agripp.* 1616.
Mr. Hoadly's *Measures of Submission.* Lond. 1706.
——————— *Preface to the Second Edition.* Ibid. 1708.
——————— *Considerations humbly offered to the Lord Bishop of* Exeter. *Ibid.* 1709.
——————— *Examination of the Patriarchal Scheme, and against Dr.* Atterbury. Ibid. 1710.
Holinshead's *Chronicles.* Lond. 1577.
Homilies appointed to be read in Churches. Lond. 1635.
Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity.* Lond. 1602.
Horatii Flacci Opera. *Lond.* 1694.

J.

KIng James's *Works.* Lond. 1616.
Jenkinsius Redivivus. *Lond.* 1681.
Josephi Ἀρχαιολογία Ἰουδ. *Basil.* 1544.
S. Irenæus contra Hæreses. *Oxon.* 1702.

Juliani

Juliani Opera. *Lipsiæ*, 1696.
Corpus Juris Civilis. *Lugd.* 1590.
Corpus Juris Canonici. *Taurin.* 1620.
Justini Martyris Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1615.
Juvenalis Satyræ. *Lugd. Bat.* 1671.

K.

KEble's *Statutes*. Lond. 1681.
Kennet's *Sermon before the Commons*. Jan. 30. 1705.
Kettlewel's *Duty of Allegiance settled upon its true Grounds*. 1691.
——— *Christianity a Doctrine of the Cross*. Lond. 1691.

L.

LActantius de Mortibus Persecutorum. *Traject. ad Rhenum*, 1692.
——— Institutiones. *Antv.* 1539.
Lambardus de priscis Anglorum legibus. *Cantab.* 1644.
Lesly's *Rehearsals*. Lond 1708.
Just. Lipsius de Cruce. *Antverp.* 1606.
Tit. Livii Historiarum quod extat. *Amstel.* 1665.
Long's *Unreasonableness of Rebellion, a Sermon at* Exeter, July 26. 1685. *Lond.* 1685.

M.

B*ishop* Manningham's *Six Sermons. Printed for* W. Crook *at the* Green-Dragon *without* Temple-Bar.
March's *Sermon at* Newcastle, Jan. 30. 1676-7. *Lond.* 1677.
Martyre de la Reyne d' Escosse Douariere de France. *Anvers*, 1588.
Dr. Meriton's *Sermon at S.* Martyn's, Jan. 30. 1660.
Milbourn's *Measure*s *of Resistance*. Lond. 1710.
——— Melius inquirendum. *Lond.* 1709.
Min. Felicis Octavius. *Lugd. Bat.* 1672.
Bishop More's *Sermon* at Guild-Hall *Chapel*. Lond. 1682.
Dr. Moss's *Sermon before the House of Commons*, Jan. 30. 1706. Lond. 1707.

N.

NIchols's *Duty of Inferiours to Superiours.* Lond. 1701.

O.

Book of Oaths. Lond. 1689.
Oecumenii Commentaria. *Lut. Par.* 1671.
Optati Milevitani Opera. *Pariſ.* 1679.
Origenis Adamantii Opera. *Johannis Parvi & Jod. Badii.*
——— *C.* Celſum. *Cantab.* 1658.

P.

PAlladius de Vita S. Chryſoſtomi. *Lut. Par.* 1680.
Biſhop Parker's *Religion and Loyalty.* Lond. 1684.
S. Paul *no Mover of Sedition.* Lond. 1706.
Velleius Paterculus. *Antv.* 1627.
Phavorini Lexicon. *Baſil.* 1538.
Philoxeni aliorumq; veterum Authorum Gloſſaria. *Lugd. Bat.* 1600.
Du Pin's Nouvelle Bibliotheque jouxte la copie à Paris, 1690.
M. A. Plauti Comœdiæ. *Lugd. Bat.* 1669.
Plea for Nonſubſcribers. Lond. 1650.
Plea of Publick Good, &c. Lond. 1706.
C. Plinii Secundi Epiſtolæ, &c. *Genev.* 1643.
Plutarchi Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1624.
M. Poli Synopſis Criticorum. *Lond.* 1669.
Polidori Vergilii Hiſtoria Anglica. *Baſil.* 1534.
Julii Pollucis Onomaſticon. *Amſtelæd.* 1706.
S. Polycarpi Epiſtola, & Martyrium. *Oxon.* 1709.
Proſperi Aquitanici Opera. *Col. Agrip.* 1609.
Prudentii Opera. *Amſterod.* 1625.

R.

REeves's *Apologies of* Juſtin Martyr, &c. *Lond.* 1709.
Bp. Robinſon's *Sermon at St.* James's, Mar. 8. 1710.
The Royal Apology. Lond. 1684.

S.

DR. Sacheverel's *Sermon at St.* Paul's, Nov. 5. 1709. *Lond.* 1709.

Salviani Opera. *Par.* 1669.
Sanderſonus de Obligatione Conſcientiæ. *Lond.* 1686.
——— *Sermons.* Lond. 1689.
L. An. Senecæ Opera. *Antv.* 1632.
Sheringham's *King's Supremacy aſſerted.* Lond. 1682.
Dr. Sherlock's *Caſe of Reſiſtance.* Lond. 1690.
——— *Caſe of Allegiance conſidered.* 1691.
Sigonius de antiquo jure civium Romanorum. *Hanov.* 1609.
Socrates & Sozomenus. *Lut. Par.* 1541.
Ælius Spartianus; in vitis Cæſarum. *Baſil.* 1546.
Hen. Stephani Theſaurus Græcæ Linguæ. *Par.* 1572.
Biſhop Stillingfleet's Origines Britannicæ. *Lond.* 1685.
Strangvage's *Hiſtory of* Mary *Q. of* Scotland. *Lond.* 1624.
Suetonii Tranquilli Cæſares. *Lugd.* 1544.
Suidas. *Col. Allobr.* 1619.
Surius de vitis Sanctorum. *Col. Agr.* 1576.
Symmonds's *Loyal Subjects Belief.* Oxford, 1643.
Syneſii Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1631.

T.

C. Taciti Opera. *Antv.* 1627.
Terentii Comœdiæ. *Roterod.* 1670.
Tertulliani Opera. *Lutet.* 1634.
Theodoreti Opera. *Lut. Par.* 1642.
——— Hiſt. Eccl. *Pariſ. Rob. Steph.* 1541.
Theophilus Antiochenus. *Lut. Par.* 1615.
Thompſon's *Sermon in the Cathedral at* Briſtol, June 21, 1685. Lond. 1685.
Title of a Thorough-Settlement examined. Lond. 1691.
Tyndale's *Tranſlation of the Bible.* Printed *A. D.* 1549.

V.

A Urelius Victor; in Romanæ Hiſtoriæ Epitome. *Amſtelod.* 1625.
Vincentii Lyrinenſis Commonitorium. *Pariſ.* 1669.
Ger. Jo. Voſſii Rhetorice contracta. *Lugd. Bat.* 1627.
A. B. Uſher's *Power of the Prince.* Lond. 1688.
Vulcatius Gallicanus; in vitis Cæſarum. *Baſil.* 1546.

W.

W.

Bishop Wake's *Sermon before the House of Peers.* Lond. 1708.
B. Waltoni Biblia Polyglotta. *Lond.* 1657.
Bishop Ward's *Seven Sermons.* Lond. 1674.
Dr. Welton's *Sermon before the Lieutenancy,* Nov. 19. 1710. Lond. 1710.
Bishop Wettenhal's Hexapla Jacobæa. *Dublin,* 1686.
Dr. Whitby's *Paraphrase and Comment upon the New Testament.* Lond. 1703.

Y.

Lord Archbishop of York's *Sermon before the House of Peers.* Lond. 1700.

X.

Xiphilini Epitome Histor. Dionis. *Par.* 1551.

A LETTER TO A *CLERGY-MAN:* Concerning Mr. *Hoadly*'s Doctrine, ABOUT The *Homilies*, and *Resistance.*

By Mr Stamp.
~~By another Hand. See p. 211~~

Fortem animum præstant rebus, quas turpiter audent.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year M DCC XI.

To the READER.

I Had not put thee under the unmerciful Penance of Reading an Argument to prove that the Sun ſhines, had not the Perſon to whom the Letter is directed, unfairly broken the ſolemn Agreement made between us, and uſed me neither like a Friend, a Gentleman, nor a Chriſtian. The Condition of my Writing was, that the Knowledge and Peruſal of what I have written, and of his Reply to it, ſhould be confined to a few ſelect Hands. But he no ſooner receives my Letter, but he immediately reviles it in all Companies, and cries out upon it as a Furious Paper, merely upon the Account of a little (not indecent) Severity in it; for which I hope I may be excuſed, ſince it was wrote for a Cauſe, in which this Gentleman gives Himſelf the Lie, and all

the Clergy of the Kingdom, who are not of His, and his Maſter Hoadly's *Opinion. For ſo doth every one who pleads, that the Homilies are reconcilable with Reſiſtance in* Any Caſe, *and for* Any Cauſe whatſoever. *Nothing of this Nature had ever been Publiſhed by me, had he not forced me to it, by his unjuſt and unreaſonable Clamours againſt the Author, paſſionately reproaching and inveighing againſt me, without any other Provocation given; openly declaring withal, that the Biſhop of the Dioceſe was made acquainted with it. And the* Brachium Seculare *(an excellent Second) is called upon for his Aſſiſtance. This is the Caſe in ſhort, judge of it, and of the Letter; and ſo I bid thee heartily farewel.*

S. *Luke*'s Day, 1710.

Reve-

Reverend Sir !

IN our late Diſcourſe, in which I defended Abſolute *Paſſive Obedience* to the Rightful King or Queen of this Realm; and you, an Obedience only Partial, qualified, or diſcretionary, I told you, (ſince we had both made ſo frequent and fruitleſs Attempts towards the Conviction and Converſion of each other, that I deſpaired of the leaſt Succeſs, and I am perſuaded, you did too) that I would only inſiſt once more on the notorious Inconſiſtency of your Principle and Actions in the Caſe controverted: So notorious, that I ſaid, you muſt needs be Self-condemned; an Accuſation I would not bring againſt any Man, if every one could not ſee it, that can tell Twenty. I ſaid, The Principle of Reſiſtance in ſome Caſes, which you publickly profeſs, and your Subſcription to the *Homilies*, (by which, as one neceſſary Condition, you hold your Eccleſiaſtical Preferment, and without doing ſo, you cannot) which univerſally, moſt flagrantly, and moſt ſignificantly forbid the leaſt Reſiſtance in any Caſe, are inconſiſtent and contradictory; and that any one who could hear, or read, and was not a perfect Idiot, muſt and could underſtand the *Homilies* in no other ſence, than that of an abſolute Non-reſiſtance. Now if I can make it appear as plainly, as that Two and Two make Four, that the *Homilies* (the whole and entire currency of them, without the leaſt poſſible Evaſion or Exception) do teach an abſolute Non-reſiſtance to our Prince in all Caſes, and for any Cauſe whatever, (and you cannot but know they do) then are You inconſiſtent with Yourſelf, and Self-condemned; and if I do not make it plainly appear, that you are ſo, I will be content to be thought guilty of uncharitable and raſh Judgment, and beg

your Pardon : Otherwiſe you muſt remember, you gave the juſt Occaſion, and Scandal of the Charge. You will, you muſt allow, that he, who maintains both Parts of an apparent Contradiction to be true, muſt neceſſarily be inconſiſtent and ſelf-condemned; if I do not prove that upon you, I will bear the Blame. I have intimated the Profeſſion of your Mouth to be for an Obedience qualified; the Subſcription of your Hand (which you have wrote, *willingly*, and *ex animo*, *vide* Can. 36.) to be for Obedience (either active or paſſive) unconditional. Now theſe are a notorious Contradiction, of which you canot poſſibly be ignorant, for which I charge you as Self-condemned; my Buſineſs is, to prove it. You are pleaſed to refer me to Mr. *Hoadly*'s *Meaſures of Submiſſion*, and tell me, that his Arguments endeavouring to reconcile the Homilies *of Obedience*, and *againſt wilful Rebellion*, with his and your Principle of Reſiſtance, are your own; and that in anſwering his, I ſhall anſwer yours. I'll ſave you the Trouble of tranſcribing and methodizing, and do it. I ſhall proceed therefore after this manner.

Firſt, I ſhall lay down your Principle of Reſiſtance.

Secondly, Produce out of the Homilies, ſome of the moſt eminent Paſſages, which can ſignify nothing elſe, but an abſolute Prohibition of any Sort of Reſiſtance whatever; (and if you can produce one Line, that allows or favours Reſiſtance in any Caſe, or any thing like it, I will yield up the Cauſe,) together with ſome curſory Reflections and Obſervations thereon; and then,

Thirdly and laſtly, Anſwer Mr. *Hoadly*'s moderate Solutions of the Difficulties of reconciling the Homilies and Reſiſtance, and ſhew both him and you to be inconſiſtent and ſelf-condemned, from your inconſiſtent and contradictory Profeſſion of Reſiſtance in ſome Caſes, and the entire Scope, Sence, and Letter of the Homilies againſt it in all, to which you both have *Willingly* and *ex Animo* Subſcribed. And,

I. I ſhall

I. I shall lay down your Principle of Resistance. It is this: That in Cases of extream and apparent Danger and Ruin to the Community, a Rightful Prince may be resisted with Violence by the People, and (if they conceive fit) may be laid aside. Now,

2. Let us see what the Homilies say to this, Those Homilies, which you say you have *willingly* and *ex animo* subscribed, as you do now *willingly* and *ex animo* promulgate the Doctrin of Resistance to our Rightful Princes, in some Cases.

In the Second Part of the Sermon of *Obedience*, are these remarkable Words: [*Pag.*65. *lin.*6.] "All Subjects "are bound to obey them, as God's Ministers, yea altho' "they be evil, not only for Fear, but also for Conscience "sake. And here (good People) let us mark *diligently*, "that it is not lawful for Inferiors and Subjects IN "ANY CASE, to resist and stand against the Superior "Powers: (*meaning Tyrannical Kings and Magistrates*) for "S. *Paul*'s Words be plain, that *whosoever withstandeth*, "*shall get to themselves damnation*; *for whosoever with-*"*standeth*, *withstandeth the ordinance of God*. To this you have subscribed, if you have subscribed to any thing; and yet you say, in some Cases, it is lawful to resist, or depose the Prince. Are not therefore your Profession and Subscription plainly inconsistent, and contradictory, as much as at the same time to be, and not to be? In some Cases, you say, you may resist; and at the same time by Subscription say, it is not lawful to resist *in any Case*. "These Homilies [*by Artic.* 35.] "are judged to be read *diligently* and *distinctly* by "you, that they may be understood by the People." Is it possible for the People, when they hear this read, to understand it in any other sence, (especially since the whole current of the Homilies are to the same effect) than of absolute Non-resistance? "It is not lawful, "*saith the Homily*, for Inferiors and Subjects, *in any* "*Case* to resist, and stand against the Superior Powers." And yet, (if that Position be true) they must understand it in the quite contrary sence, that it is lawful in some cases. If therefore your Doctrin be true, when you

read this or the other Homily *againſt Rebellion*, when you come to this, or the like Sentence, (if you would be juſt to the Souls of your Pariſhioners, for whoſe Sins and Errors you will be reſponſible, if occaſioned by your wilful neglect) you ought to tell them, that the Truth of the Doctrine and Meaning of the Homily are diametrically oppoſite to the Sound and Sence of the Letter: And that whereſoever they find the Words, *You ſhall in no caſe reſiſt*, they are to underſtand, they are to reſiſt in ſome caſes; otherwiſe it is no more poſſible from the Letter, Sence, Coherence, and univerſal Tendency of the Homilies, to find Reſiſtance in ſome caſes lawful, (when in every place they ſay, it is unlawful) than it is for any one of your Flock to believe it lawful to commit Adultery, when you preach it to be utterly and *toto genere* unlawful. And here, methinks, it is very pleaſant to obſerve, that your *Dux Gregis*, Mr. *Hoadly*, and your ſelf too, in your Expoſitions of the two firſt Verſes of the 13th to the *Romans*, exclude a total Non-reſiſtance, and yet muſt allow it by Subſcription to this Homily, which plainly brings thoſe Words of S. *Paul* to prove the Duty of abſolute Non-reſiſtance to evil Princes, ſaying, "S. *Paul*'s Words be plain, that whoſoever withſtandeth ſuch a Prince, ſhall get to themſelves Damnation; for whoſoever withſtandeth, withſtandeth the Ordinance of God." But you and Mr. *Hoadly* ſay, that he that withſtandeth ſuch a Prince in ſome caſes, ſhall merit, ſhall not only be more likely to be in a State of Safety here, but (if he be not otherwiſe an unrepenting Sinner) he ſhall be ſure of Eternal Salvation hereafter. Is it poſſible for any Man, reading the Homilies, to believe, that one Man in the World would or could underſtand them in your Sence? For my part I do not believe it poſſible. To have the Homilies literally condemn Reſiſtance in all caſes, even without the leaſt ſhadow of Exception; and for ſome with great Aſſurance, to affirm that they do not do it, is a greater Affront to the common Senſe of Mankind, than it can be an act of Uncharitableneſs for any one to ſay, ſuch an Aſſertor is inconſiſtent and

ſelf-

ſelf-condemned. This is literally to put out the Eyes and ſtop up the Ears of Mankind, or to ſay, that none can ſee or hear but your ſelves. 'Tis true, we are not obliged to conſent to every Expreſſion in the Homilies, or to ſay, the Application of every Text of Scripture is exact; yet are we obliged to the general Scope and Tendency of every Homily, or elſe I know not why they were framed, or commanded to be read for the Inſtruction of the People. If you ſay, we are not thus obliged, I know no other way of inſtructing the People in the Sence of the Homilies, (which were deſigned with that brevity and plainneſs, as to want no Explication) than to declare the Sence of them to be exactly contrary to the Letter. Whether Reſiſtance be lawful or not, is not at preſent the Diſpute between you and me, only whether the Homilies allow it in any caſe. I ſay no, you ſay yes. I can read my Aſſertion in them in moſt expreſs Words. Do you prove but one juſt Inference for your Argument, and it ſhall be allowed. Whether Mr. *Hoadly*'s Expoſition of the two firſt Verſes of the 13th to the *Romans*, for Reſiſtance, be right or wrong, it is not my buſineſs now to determine; it is enough for me, that the Homily quoted ſays peremptorily, that S. *Paul* in that place declares abſolutely againſt all manner of Reſiſtance. If the Homily be miſtaken in the Sence of the Text, and its Application, it makes no great matter, for the caſe is not now, whether the Text be here rightly underſtood and expounded in the Homily, but whether a Man of common Senſe can ſuppoſe the Homily to underſtand it in favour of Reſiſtance in any caſe; or whether a Man in his Wits can believe, that any one can ſubſcribe thoſe Words of S. *Paul*, as encouraging, or but ſo much as allowing any manner of Reſiſtance, when there is not one Expreſſion in any Homily for Reſiſtance, but all againſt reſiſting in any ſence, caſe, or under any temptation. If the Law of Nature (as is pretended) be for Reſiſtance, I am ſure the Homilies are not. They may therefore be diſcarded and reprobated; but whilſt they ſtand amongſt the authentick Acts of our Church, abſolute Non-reſiſtance

will

will be the Doctrine of it, and all Subscribers must own it, or lay themselves under the deserved Imputation of the most apparent *Autocatacrisy* in nature. If you have not subscribed to the Doctrine of absolute Non-resistance in subscribing the Homilies, be pleased to tell me in your Answer, what you have subscribed to, and how it may be collected from the Homilies which you have subscribed.

Mr. *Hoadly* (and you his *Umbra*) say, when a Prince abuseth his Authority, to the great mischief or ruin of his Subjects, that he loseth his Authority, and may be resisted; and yet you both subscribe the quite contrary in the aforesaid Homily of *Obedience*: Read these Words, beginning at the 12th Line; and you may as well say they are not there, as that the sense of them is not wholly exclusive of Resistance in any case: "Our Saviour Christ himself, and his Apostles, received many and divers Injuries of the unfaithful and wicked Men in Authority; yet we never read, that they or any of them caused any Sedition or Rebellion against Authority. We read oft, that they patiently suffered all Troubles, Vexations, Slanders, Pangs, and Pains, and Death itself (*oh foolish Martyrs!*) obediently, without Tumult or Resistance. They committed their Cause to him that judgeth righteously, and prayed for their Enemies heartily and earnestly. They knew, that the Authority of the Powers was God's Ordinance, and therefore both in their Words and Deeds they taught ever Obedience to it, and never taught, nor did, the contrary. The wicked Judge *Pilate* said to Christ, *Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power also to loose thee?* Jesus answered, *Thou could'st have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.* Whereby Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked Rulers have their Power and *Authority* from God, (*How then do they fall from it for being Wicked and Tyrannical?*) and therefore it is not lawful for their Subjects to withstand them, although they abuse their Power." Here the Homily plainly distin-

distinguisheth between the Authority of the Higher Powers, and the End for which it is given; both which you confound and make the same. "They knew, saith the "Homily, that the Authority of the Powers was God's "Ordinance, and therefore both in Words and Deeds "they taught ever Obedience to it, and never taught, "nor did, the contrary." You say, in flat contradiction to what you subscribe, that they had *no Authority*, whilst they did thus barbarously Persecute, and ought to have been resisted. The Homily says, "Where-"by Christ taught us plainly, that even the wicked "Rulers have their Power and Authority from God, "and therefore it is not lawful for their Subjects to "withstand them." You say as plainly, Such wicked and tyrannical Rulers have no Power or Authority from God, and therefore ought to be withstood. Are not these gross Inconsistencies and Contradictions, and can you choose but see them? Pray (Sir!) try your Hand to reconcile and qualify them. If your Parishioners should hear you read this Homily, could they take it in any other than a literal Sense; or believe you, if you said You did? And yet you ought to tell them so, when you read this Homily, for otherwise it is impossible for them to know, that you take it so. And thus it becomes you to act with them in all Faithfulness; for either absolute Non-resistance is a damnable Doctrine, or Resistance in any case is; and it is as necessary for them to know, which of these is the damnable Sin, as to know the Sinfulness of any other Vice whatever.

[*P. 66, 67.*] The Homily produces the case of *David's* having had twice an opportunity of destroying *Saul*, his mortal Enemy, and of his refusing to do it, purely out of the Sense he had of the plain Duty of Non-resistance; and of his slaying the *Amalekite*, for killing *Saul* in the most favourable case; as an unanswerable Argument, that neither one, nor all the Subjects of a tyrannical Prince, ought to resist with violence their Sovereign Lord. I have heard you yourself say, You would resist him with violence, on a personal Invasion of your Life; and you may as well do it on the Invasion

of

of your Property; (and no queſtion but you may do it ſingly, as well as in conjunction with a great number, for the caſe of one is the caſe of all) but I think the Homily puts the Objection, and makes the Anſwer in direct oppoſition to you. Read them both in theſe Words: " But peradventure ſome here would ſay, " That *David* in his own defence might have killed " King *Saul* lawfully, and with a ſafe conſcience. But " holy *David* did know, that he might in nowiſe with- " ſtand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign Lord and King: " He did know, that he was but King *Saul*'s Subject, " tho' he were in great Favour with God, and his Ene- " my King *Saul* out of God's Favour. Therefore tho' " he were *never ſo much provoked*, yet he refuſed utterly " to hurt the Lord's Anointed. He durſt not for of- " fending God, and his own Conſcience, (although he " had occaſion and opportunity) once lay his Hands " upon God's high Officer the King, whom he did " know to be a Perſon reſerved, and kept, (for his " Office ſake) *only to God's Puniſhment and Judgment*; " therefore he prayeth ſo oft and earneſtly, that he lay " not his Hands upon the Lord's Anointed." Now here the Homily ſays, in as plain Words as Men can write in, (if they are not ſo, pray do you make them plainer) " That a Subject may in no wiſe, with a ſafe " Conſcience, withſtand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign " Lord and King, tho' never ſo Perſecuting and Tyran- " nical: Tho' he were *never ſo much provoked*, ought " not he to do it, *(which, I hope, excludeth all caſes, for* " *nothing can exceed the utmoſt Provocation)* knowing " ſuch a Perſon to be reſerved, and kept (for his Office " ſake) *only to God's Puniſhment and Judgment*;" *and therefore not to the Judgment and Puniſhment of one, or all the People.* But perhaps you will not ſtick to ſay, when he becomes a Tyrant, he ceaſeth to be a King, *(I have known you ſtoop ſo low at a dead lift)* and therefore in re- ſiſting and murdering ſuch an one, according to your pretended Law of Self-preſervation you do not reſiſt your King, but a lawleſs Tyrant. I reply, you cannot but have heard of that true and univerſally received diſtincti-

on

on of *Tyrannus ſine titulo*, and *Tyrannus exercitio*; the laſt of which is the ſuppoſed caſe in the Homilies, in contradiſtinction to the former; for at the ſame time they prohibit Reſiſtance to ſuch an one, they declare him to be the lawful King and Prince; and for that cauſe not to be reſiſted on any Provocation. Now ſuppoſe there was truth in your Objection, yet is it manifeſt, that by your Subſcription you have as clearly oppoſed it, as the ſtouteſt Paſſive Obedience-Man alive, unleſs a Man is arrived at that perfection, as to deny his own hand. It is very remarkable, "That *David* is ſaid to pray oft "and earneſtly that God would not ſuffer him to lay "his Hands upon the Lord's Anointed, King *Saul*." He was afraid leſt he ſhould be tempted by ſuch *Glorious Opportunities* to tranſgreſs his Duty, and therefore begged God's Aſſiſtance and preventing Grace. But had you been in his caſe, (notwithſtanding all the Subſcriptions and Obligations to the contrary, from Laws Divine and Human) you would have embraced the firſt, thanked God for the occaſion, and immortalized the Act with the title of *Providence*, and a *Glorious Deliverance*. And that even ſuch a wicked and tyrannical Prince, is yet an inſtrument and cauſe too of much Good to the People in a great many caſes, (and violent Reſiſtance in none) and ſo anſwers S. *Paul*'s Character, *that he is the Miniſter of God for good*, (whatever Mr. *Hoadly* and you may profeſs) is evidently ſhewn to be the Sence of the Compilers and Authoriſers of this Homily, from theſe following Words. [*P. 69. l.* 1.] "And by theſe two Examples (of *David*'s Non-reſiſt-"ance of *Saul* in the Camp and in the Cave) Holy "*David* (being named in Scripture a Man after God's "own Heart) giveth a *general* Rule and Leſſon to *all* "Subjects in the World, not to withſtand their Liege "Lord and King, not to take a Sword by their *private* "Authority againſt the King, God's Anointed, who "only *(and therefore no other)* beareth the Sword by "God's Authority, for the Maintenance of the Good, "and for the Puniſhment of the Evil, (which yet *Saul* "was far from doing in relation to innocent *David*,

"and

" and several other of his good Subjects, for he was a " Persecutor) who only *(and therefore no other against him)* " by God's Law hath the use of the Sword at his " command, and also hath all Power, Jurisdiction, " Regiment, Correction, and Punishment, as Supreme " Governor of all his Realms and Dominions, and " that even by the Authority of God, and by God's Or- " dinance." It is plain by the Persecution of *David*, that *Saul* could not be said to maintain the Good in that particular, (nor in the case of Hundreds of others, of which I will make mention, when I come to answer Mr. *Hoadly*'s Argument, that *David*'s was a private and personal Case) for he persecuted most unjustly his faithful Subject: So that the Sence of such a Prince's being said to bear the Sword by God's Authority for the Maintenance of the Good, is expressive both of what a Prince ought to do, and what the worst of Princes in some measure do, vastly beyond the Benefits (upon a due Calculation, and ballancing Accounts from History) of forcible Resistance on the most plausible Pretext. " These Examples (continues the Homily *l.* 25.) being " so manifest and evident, *(meaning of Passive Obedience under Tyrants)* " it is an intolerable Ignorance, " Madness, and Wickedness, for Subjects to make any " Murmuring, Rebellion, Resistance, or Withstanding, " Commotion, or Insurrection against their most dear " and dread Sovereign Lord and King, ordained and " appointed of God's Goodness for their Commodity, " Peace and Quietness." And all this tho' such Tyrants should not tolerably answer the Ends of the Authority conferred on them by God. If this be true, (as a Man of tolerable Reach must believe, that Mr. *Hoadly* and you thought so by your voluntary Subscriptions, and he must put great Force upon himself to believe otherwise, or else what Faith is to be reposed in Words and Subscriptions?) *what intolerable Ignorance, Madness, and Wickedness must you be guilty of in maintaining, that your lawful Prince may be resisted and coerced; and in maintaining all this too, from the concurrent Sence of the Homilies?* And here Mr. *Hoadly* hath consented to a strong Answer

to

to a very weak Queſtion he hath more than once ſtarted, in relation to the Duty of Abſolute Obedience, implying, that if Obedience to our Prince be abſolute, then we ought to do whatever he commands us, whether the thing be lawful or unlawful; whereas this very Homily in Scripture-Words, to which he hath ſubſcribed, (*after having injoined Abſolute Obedience to the worſt Princes*) caſteth our Duty of Abſolute Obedience into Paſſive as well as Active, ſaying, "Yet let us believe undoubtedly (good Chriſtian People) that we "may not obey Kings, Magiſtrates, or any other, "(though they be our own Fathers) if they would command us to do any thing contrary to God's Commandments. In ſuch a caſe we ought to ſay, with "the Apoſtle, *We muſt rather obey God than Man.* But "nevertheleſs in that caſe, we may not in anywiſe "withſtand violently, or rebell againſt Rulers, or make "any Inſurrection, Sedition, or Tumults, either by "force of Arms, (or otherwiſe) againſt the Anointed "of the Lord, or any of his Officers; but we muſt in "ſuch caſe, patiently *ſuffer all Wrongs and Injuries,* (*therefore not revenge the greateſt; this uſed to be the way of reaſoning in former times*) "referring the Judgment "of our Cauſe only to God; *and therefore not to the Arbitration of the People.* Such an Objection to an Abſolute Obedience is much below the Sence of Mr. *Hoadly*, when he writes on defenſible Subjects.

In the third and laſt part of this Sermon of *Obedience*, *l.* 7. is recapitulated in few Words the Sence of the foregoing, *That for no cauſe we may reſiſt the Magiſtrate, tho' he be wicked*; as it is ſaid in the ſecond part, *That we may in no caſe reſiſt*; Words entirely of the ſame Sence, and almoſt of the ſame Letters. I would not for the World, it had been ſaid, *We may not reſiſt upon any Pretence whatever*; for then ſome of our Divines, according to their modern Divinity and Caſuiſtry, would have nimbly replied, It is true, we may not reſiſt upon any *Pretence*, but we may in a real Caſe, or for a real Cauſe; as if the Word there, *Pretence*, was not totally excluſive; tho' Perſons of leſs Sagacity and Penetration, would

would have thought the Statute in the first Year of King *Charles* the Second's Recovery of his Crown, forbidding Resistance *on any Pretence* whatever, to have signified *for no Cause, or in no Case* conceivable, especially when some other Acts about the same time told the World, That *the Power of the Sword was, and is always solely in the King,* (and then not by any original Authority in the People) and that *neither Lords, nor Commons, collectively nor representatively, had any coercive Power over him.* [*vide* 12 and 13 of *Charles* the Second] And I must tell you, Sir! had the Homilies said no more than barely, *We may not resist our lawful Prince,* and had they not been confirmed by Parliament, but Convocation only, you must be supposed to have subscribed them in the Sence of Absolute Non-resistance, and in no other: For the whole Statute-Law is so clearly for Absolute Non-resistance, that I will give up the Cause, if you can produce one, that but seems to favour Resistance before these late Disputes began. And for this reason therefore, if for no other, your Homilies must be supposed to mean Absolute Non-resistance, since the Statutes most evidently do so; for the 36th Canon which injoins you to subscribe the 39 Articles, and in pursuance of it, the Books of Homilies, is founded originally on the Authority of the 25th of *Henry* the Eighth, which nulls any Canon or Ecclesiastical Law made in contradiction to any precedent Law of the Land. So, that since the Laws allow of the Subscription, authorised by an immediate Authority only of King and Convocation, they can be supposed only to allow the Homilies (were there but these six Words in them, *Thou shalt not resist thy Prince*) in that Sence, in which the Statutes against Resistance must be taken; otherwise the Law would allow a Subscription contrary to Law. *Lin.* 16, 17. The King is called *God's High Principal Judge on Earth*; therefore the People are his Inferiours, and cannot judge him. This is the common way of Argumentation, and the Sence of your Subscription, if it can mean any thing. *P.* 69. *l.* 24. The Homily conceives the Sence of S. *Peter* to be, 1 *Pet.* 2. That *Kings*

are

are chief Heads and Rulers; and says, *The Words are so plain, that they need no Exposition*; but they have need of Exposition, (and of an uncommon Head and Face too, to do it) if they must mean the quite contrary, that they are neither *chief Heads*, nor *Rulers*; for such they are not, if the People can lawfully resist or depose them: for he who hath Power over another, in as much, and as far as he hath that Power, is the other's Head and Ruler. [*Lin.* 34.] the Sermon saith, This is God's "Ordinance, God's Commandment, and God's holy "Will, that the whole Body of every Realm, and all the "Members and Parts of the same shall be subject to "their Head, the King; and that (as St. *Peter* writeth) "for the Lord's sake; and (as St. *Paul* writeth) for "Conscience sake, and not for Fear only." How is this reconcilable with your's, and your Friend *Hoadly*'s giving Power to the great People of the Land, to resist in some Cases their Lawful Prince; when by the full scope of the precedent parts of this Homily, this same King is declar'd to be irresistible in *any Case*, or for *any Cause* whatever? If you can reconcile this, you have a strange Faculty of making Peace between the most opposite Things in Nature, apparent and flaming Contradictions. At this Healing Rate, Sir! I defy you to Preach the most plain, practical Sermon, by which your Parishioners can be edified; nay, know what you mean: It will be impossible for them to understand you, unless they take along with them this infallible Rule, That they must be sure to understand you always in a Sence directly opposite to the Sound and Letter of your Doctrin.

I come now to the Homily against *Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*. By the by, give me leave to observe, That your Patron Mr. *Hoadly*, in his *Measures of Submission*, hath, (I will not say, designedly) passed over the Notice of this *Exhortation, concerning good Order and Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*; as if he had never Subscribed to it, nor had been obliged to reconcile it with his present publick Military Declarations.

[*Part* I. *pag.* 354. *lin.* 3.] The Homily argues *à fortiori*, " That if Servants ought to obey their Masters, " not only being gentle, but such as be froward; as " well and MUCH MORE ought Subjects to be " obedient, not only to their good and courteous, but " also to their sharp and rigorous Princes; *therefore not to resist them with Violence.* [*Lin.* 5.] The Homily declares, that God not only constituteth Princes to prevent Confusions, and for the Benefit and Quiet of Subjects, but also, that they may resemble him in Power and Authority too; saying, " So hath he constituted, " ordained, and set Earthly Princes over particular " Kingdoms and Dominions in Earth, both for the " avoiding of all Confusion, which else would be in the " World, if it should be without Governors; and for " the great Quiet and Benefit of Earthly Men their Sub- " jects; and also, that the Princes themselves in " *Authority*, *Power*, Wisdom, Providence, and Righte- " ousness, in Government of People and Countries " committed to their Charge, should resemble his Hea- " venly Governance; as the Majesty of Heavenly Things " may by the Baseness of Earthly Things be shadowed " and resembled. Now if they were not irresistible, they could not be like him in *Power* and *Authority*. Perhaps you will say, But our King hath not Power and Authority to make Laws without the Concurrence of the Parliament, and therefore his Power cannot resemble the Power of God, who can make what Laws he pleases. I reply, As God can and doth often oblige himself to Laws of his own Concession, so may Concessions be made by Earthly Potentates: And as God is Almighty, notwithstanding such Concessions, whereby he has obliged himself to his Creatures; so is the King irresistible, by the Letter and Sence of all his Laws; notwithstanding such Legal and Statute-Concessions, to which he stands in strict Conscience bound.

[*Pag.* 355. *lin.* 7.] " The Scriptures declare, *saith* " *the Homily*, that when the Wicked do reign, then Men " go to ruin; and again, A foolish Prince destroyeth the People, and a covetous King undoeth his Subjects:

and

and yet this same Homily saith, that such a King or Prince is not to be withstood with Violence. Read the following Answer. "What shall Subjects do then? Shall "they obey valiant, stout, wise, and good Princes; and "contemn, disobey, and rebel against Children being "their Princes, or against indiscreet and evil Go-"vernors? God forbid! For first, What a perilous "thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the Judge-"ment, which Prince is wise and godly, and his "Government good, and which is otherwise? as "though the Foot must judge of the Head: An En-"terprize very heinous, and must needs breed Rebel-"lion:" And yet you and Mr. *Hoadly* openly maintain the contrary to what you have subscribed in this Homily; you teach, that such Princes may be withstood with Violence, and deposed. Your Principles are, That when a King goeth about to *ruin, destroy*, and *undo his People*, he may be resisted and deposed; (nay, that he ought to be so served) but the Homily says, in as plain Words as possible, that tho' he should go about to *ruin, destroy*, and *undo his People*, yet he is still not to be resisted. Whatever Objection the Wit of Man may make to the Doctrin of Irresistibility, it cannot possibly object to the Sence of the Homily in that Point. To endeavour to do it, is to impose on the Common Sense of Mankind. And in my Conscience, I do not believe from the Beginning of the World to this Day, and from this Day to the End of it, that ever any Hereditary Prince, who had Heirs, ever did, or will design the total Ruin or Destruction of his Subjects, (for that would be to destroy Himself, and his Posterity after him) but only through excessive Weakness, or prevalence of evil (but unsuspected) Counsel, he might possibly be extreamly injurious to them, and, by consequence, much more to his own true and proper Interest. [*Lin.* 19, *&c.*] "Rebellion is called the greatest of "all Mischiefs, and Rebels the worst of all Sub-"jects; meaning, (as it appears by the context) Re-"sistance to Princes on any Account, tho' they were the worst of Men: And yet you and Mr. *Hoadly* proclaim

it, *The Glorious Cause of GOD.* Here wants another Healing stroke. Let Resistance in some Cases be the Cause of GOD as much as it will, when you can reconcile it with the Homilies, or reconcile Yourself with Yourself, in this case you shall be the Great *Apollo* of the Age. Suppose you should Preach the Homilies to them, who never read, or heard of them before, Is it possible for them to receive them in a qualified sence of Resistance somewhere, and sometimes? I have heard of a scandalous Reflexion cast on a Preacher, that he should bid his People follow what he said, not what he did: but I never before heard one intimate, that the People should not believe one Word he told them from the Pulpit or Desk, as you do; when out of the Church you declare for Resistance of the Prince in some Cases; and in the Church, in reading the Homilies you declare it unlawful in any Case. And that you once thought the Homilies, and some Practices, utterly inconsistent, I have great reason to believe, from an Expression I have heretofore heard from you.

[*Pag. eadem, lin.* 36.] "A Rebel is worse than the worst "Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst Govern-"ment of the worst Prince that *hitherto* hath been." Can you Subscribe an Homily in which are these Words, and yet plead for Resistance in *any Case?* Is a Rebel, *i.e.* (as is the Sence of both Homilies, of that *of Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*, and of this, *against Wilful Rebellion*) a Person resisting his Lawful Prince with Violence, worse than the worst Prince; and Rebellion, *i.e.* (according to these Homilies any manner of violent Resistance of our Lawful Prince) worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince that *hitherto* hath been: And yet is a Rebel and Rebellion better too, at the same time? Can the same thing be better and worse at the same Instant? And yet it must be so, if he, who resisteth such a Prince, is better than the worst Prince, as you profess them; yet much worse than the worst Prince, as your Subscription testifies. What Distance and Difference are there between Tongue and Hand! It will not be enough to say, (as your Friend Mr. *Hoadly* doth imply) that

that the following words call that only Rebellion, which is raised for small Matters. The precedent words cut off all manner of Relief for Resistance of any Sort, and in any Case. Besides, tho' the Homily says, " Rebels are unmeet Ministers, and Rebellion an unfit " and unwholsom Medicin to reform any small Lacks " in a Prince, or to cure any little Griefs in Government:" Yet it says also in the very next words, " Such lewd Remedies *(you call them godly ones)* are " far worse than any other Maladies and Disorders *(without any Exception, of what Kind or Degree they be)* " that can be in the Body of the Commonwealth.

[*Pag.* 356. *lin.* 6.] But what if the Prince be undiscreet, and evil indeed, and is also evident to all " Men's Eyes that he is so? Here the most Tyrannical Prince is supposed, and that his Tyranny is so notorious, that every body must needs see it. What is to be done in such a Case? This is your supposed Case of National and Notorious Tyranny; and yet even here, no other Arms or Remedies are allowed, but the old rusty *Preces & Lachrymæ*, and Amendment of our naughty Lives, most commonly (if not always) the Judicial Cause of National Calamities. " I ask again, (saith " the Homily) What if it be long of the Wickedness of " the Subjects, that the Prince is undiscreet and evil? " Shall the Subjects both by their Wickedness provoke " God, for their deserved Punishment, to give them an " evil or undiscreet Prince; and also rebel against " him, and withall against God, who, for the Punish- " ment of their Sins, did give them such a Prince? " God (say the holy Scriptures) maketh *(not only permitteth)* a wicked Man to reign for the Sins of the " People." And that the Homily meaneth this Text not in the sence of Permission only, but of Approbation too, of the Prince, not of the Wickedness of him: *quatenus Rex, non quatenus Tyrannus*; read it thus, beginning at *Lin.* 28. " If we will have an evil Prince " (when God shall send such an one) taken away, and " a good one in his Place, let us take away our Wick- " edness, which provoketh God to place such an one

" over us, and God will either displace him, *(though Men ordinarily have not Faith enough to trust God in such* " *a Case)* or of an evil Prince make him a good one; so " that we first will change our Evil into Good. For " will you hear the Scriptures? The Heart of the Prince " is in God's Hand, *(some People think, they are safer,* " *when the King's Heart is in their own Hand)* which way " soever it shall please him, he turneth it. Thus say the " Scriptures: Wherefore let us turn from our Sins unto " the Lord with all our Hearts, and he will turn the " Heart of the Prince unto our Quiet and Wealth: Else " for Subjects to deserve through their Sins to have an " evil Prince, and then to rebel against him, were " double and treble Evil, by provoking God more to " plague them. Nay, let us either deserve to have a " good Prince, or let us patiently suffer, and obey such " as we deserve. And whether the Prince be good " or evil, let us, according to the Counsel of the holy " Scriptures, pray for the Prince, for his continuance " and increase in Goodness, if he be good; and for his " amendment, if he be evil." Tho' therefore a Tyrannical Prince be a Judgment of God on a Nation, as is a Plague or Pestilence, yet are we not to endeavour to remove him ourselves, as we would an Epidemical Distemper; (as is the Sence sometimes, and Expression of some of your Brethren) at least the Sence of the Homily is full to the contrary, and that is enough for my Purpose. And, [*Pag.* 357.] the *Sermon* tells you, that such a Monster and Tyrant reigned about the time of St. *Paul*'s writing this Epistle; saying, [*Line* 1.] " And I pray you, who was Prince over the most part of " the Christians, when God's Holy Spirit by St. *Paul*'s " Pen gave them this Lesson? Forsooth! *Caligula*, " *Claudius*, or *Nero*; who were not only no Christians, " but Pagans, and also either foolish Rulers, or most cruel " Tyrants:" Meaning, that S. *Paul* designed absolute Non-resistance to the worst of Tyrants: For supposing St. *Paul* had wrote this Epistle, or the other to the *Romans*, within the *quinquennium* of *Nero*, (as Mr. *Hoadly* hopes, the kind World will take upon trust on his Conjecture,

dure, without Proof) it is plain, the Publick Voice, both of Church and State in the Homily, ſuppoſeth it a Duty under the worſt of Princes, by naming the Perſons of the Emperours, *Caligula*, *Claudius*, or *Nero*. And the following Inſtance of the *Jews* being commanded abſolute Non-reſiſtance (not becauſe they could not reſiſt, but becauſe they ought not, tho' they had had Power, for the Command is without Reſtriction or Limitation) to *Nebuchadonoſor* King of *Babylon*, under the ſevereſt Acts of Tyranny and Perſecution, is, *ad corroborandum*, and is a ſuperabundant Addition to the Strength of my Poſition; That Abſolute Non-reſiſtance is an indiſpenſable Duty, and that it is the univerſal and unavoidable Sence of the Homilies. Begin at [*Lin.* 5.] "Will you yet hear the Word of God to the *Jews*, "when they were Priſoners under *Nebuchadonoſor* King "of *Babylon*, after he had ſlain their King, Nobles, "Parents, Children and Kinsfolks, burned their Coun-"try, Cities, yea *Jeruſalem* itſelf, and the holy Tem-"ple, and had carried the reſidue remaining alive, "captive with him to *Babylon?* Will you hear yet, "what the Prophet *Baruch* ſaith unto God's People being "in this Captivity? Pray you, ſaith the Propher, "for the Life of *Nebuchadonoſor* King of *Babylon*, (*Knock him on the Head, ſay you, ſuch a Rebel againſt his Subjects!*) "and for the Life of *Balthaſar* his Son; that their Days "may be as the Days of Heaven upon the Earth; that "God alſo may give us Strength and lighten our Eyes, "that we may live under the Defence of *Nebuchadonoſor* "King of *Babylon*, (*It ſeems then, a Nation might make a ſhift, eſpecially if it were not rebellious and reſiſting, to live under ſuch a Prince, tho' not ſo comfortably, as under a gracious one;*) "and under the Protection of *Baltha-*"*ſar* his Son; that we may long do them Service, (*What! ſuch Tyrants, as were not fit to live?*) "and "find Favour in their ſight. Pray for us alſo unto "the Lord our God, for we have ſinned againſt the "Lord our God. Thus far the Prophet *Baruch* his "Words, which were ſpoken by him (continues the "Homily) unto the People of God, of that King, who

" was an Heathen, a Tyrant, and cruel Oppressor of " them, and had been a murderer of many *Thousands* " of their Nation, *(will you, Sir! suffer your Prince to proceed half so far, before you resist him? and I dare engage, if he was a notorious Tyrant, he shall not desire more;)* " and a destroyer of their Country, with a Confession " that their Sins had deserved such a Prince to reign " over them. And shall the old Christians, (say the " Compilers of this Homily) by S. *Paul*'s Exhortation " pray for *Caligula*, *Claudius*, or *Nero?* Shall the *Jews* " pray for *Nebuchadonosor?* These Emperors and Kings " being Strangers unto them, being Pagans and Infi- " dels, being Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppressors " of them, and Destroyers of their Country-men and " Kinsmen, the Burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities, " and Temples: And shall not we pray for the long, " prosperous, and godly Reign of our Natural Prince? " no Stranger, *&c.*" If absolute Non-resistance was due to such Princes, (as the Homily most plainly saith it was) I desire you to give the Character of one that may be resisted without bidding Defiance to the Homily. Find him out, and then I will tell you more of my mind. Again, *p.* 358. *l.* 13. speaking in commendation of the Prince then reigning, (saith the Homily) " What shall we say of these Men, who use themselves " thus Rebelliously against their Gracious Sovereign? " who, if God *for their Wickedness* had given them an " *Heathen Tyrant* to reign over them, were *by God's* " *Word* bound to obey him, and to pray for him." *Your Interpretation of this in your next.*

[*Part.* II. *p.* 361.] The Homily (after having plentifully set down the famous Cases of *Saul* and *David* against Resistance of any sort or size) asketh and resolveth these remarkable Questions; saying, " Let *David* " answer to such Demands, as Men desirous of Rebel- " lion do use to make: Shall not we, specially being " so good Men as we are, rise and rebel against a " Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy; and there- " fore likely not to prosper either in War or Peace, but " to be hurtful and pernicious to the Commonwealth?

" No

" No, saith good and godly *David*, God's and *such a* " *King's* faithful Subject: And so convicting such Sub- " jects as attempt any Rebellion against *such a King*, " to be neither good Subjects nor good Men." So saith consistent and honest *Timothy* by manual Subscription; but by oral Profession quite otherwise declareth *Philautus*: " But, say they, shall we not rise and rebel against " so unkind a Prince, nothing considering or regarding " our true, faithful, and painful Service, or the safe- " guard of our Posterity? No, saith good *David*, whom " no such unkindness could cause to forsake his due " Obedience to his Sovereign." To this your outward Man assents by voluntary Subscription, but your inward Man declares the contrary from the great Law of Self-preservation. There is nothing like sleeping in a whole Skin. " Shall we not, say they, rise and rebel " against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy, that " seeketh our Lives? No, saith godly *David*, who had " learned the Lesson that our Saviour afterwards plain- " ly taught, That we should do no hurt to our Fellow- " Subjects, though they hate us and be our Enemies: " Much less *unto our Prince*, though he were our Enemy." I beg *David*'s and my Prince's Pardon for that, (quoth *Philautus*) for though I subscribe with one hand, I'll run him through with the other, or perhaps with the same, if he violently invade the superiour Authority of the Kingdom of *Me*. " Shall we not assemble an Ar- " my of such good Fellows as we are, and by hazard- " ing of our Lives, and the Lives of such as withstand " us, and withal hazarding the whole Estate of our " Country, remove so naughty a Prince? No, saith " godly *David*, for I, when I might without assembling " Force, or number of Men, without Tumult or hazard " of any Man's Life, or shedding of any drop of Blood, " have deliver'd my Self and my Country (*my Country*, *says* David; *so that his Case then was not personal only, as Mr.* Hoadly *would weakly persuade the World, as I will shew you afterwards: however it is plain, the Homily cannot be supposed to think so*) " of an evil Prince, yet would I " not do it." The more fool *David*, (replies *Philautus*) that

that could have deliver'd his Country so easily, with one single Blow; whereas other Subjects, that labour sometimes under great Tyranny, cannot remove the Instrument without vast Destruction and Blood-shed; and most times not so neither. What I have subscribed, I have subscribed; but for all that *David* shall be no Example or Casuist for me. "Are not they, say "some, lusty and couragious Captains, valiant Men of "Stomach, and good Mens Bodies, that do venture by "Force to kill, and depose their King. being a naughty "Prince, and their mortal Enemy? *(What think you of this?)* They may be as lusty and couragious as they "list, yet saith godly *David*, they can be no good, nor "godly Men that do so: For I not only have rebuked, "but also commanded him to be slain, as a wicked "Man, which slew King *Saul*, mine Enemy, tho' he "being weary of his Life for the loss of the Victory "against his Enemies, desired that Man to slay him." This is all wrong on my conscience (quoth *Philautus)* I would have made the bold *Amalekite* at least a Secretary of State. Is this the Reward of good and vertuous Actions, to dye for killing the Publick Enemy of my Country? This is small Encouragement to do bravely. "What shall we then do to an evil, to an unkind "Prince, an Enemy to us, hateful of God, hurtful to "the Commonwealth, *&c.*? Lay no violent Hand "upon him, saith good *David*, but let him live until "God appoint and work his End, either by natural "Death, or in War by lawful Enemies, not by traite-"rous Subjects." That is no Policy for me, (quoth *Philautus)* for so he may live to hang me first, and then how shall I be able to answer it to the prime and fundamental Law of Nature, sweet, sweet Self-preservation? No, I'll never be guilty of so great a Sin, when I can prevent it. Is not this your present Profession; and the other, the incontestable Sence of the Homilies? Now what Faith can be reposed in such a Subscription, and such a Profession? The Wit of Man can never reconcile them, nor persuade the World, You are not self-condemned. He, that can believe you are not,

seems

ſeems to me more ſelf-condemned, if poſſible. I have heard you ſay the ſame of thoſe, who profeſſed the Doctrines of Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, and did not in all points act accordingly; and frequently called them Damned Rogues. Are they more inconſiſtent and ſelf-condemned than your ſelf? No Man will believe ſo, and you cannot your ſelf. If your Principles and thoſe of your Party be inconſiſtent with Paſſive Obedience, I am ſure (and all Mankind may know it) that the Homilies are as inconſiſtent with Reſiſtance in any caſe. My buſineſs is not about the Truth either of abſolute Non-reſiſtance, or qualified, but about the irreconcilable Inconſiſtency of the Homilies with Reſiſtance in any caſe. If the Homilies are conſiſtent with the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, why do thoſe of the Laity, who are for the Doctrine of Reſiſtance, ſo openly wiſh and declare their Deſire to have them legally diſmiſſed; and the Clergy, who write for Reſiſtance, generally pretermit them; or if they are forced to touch on them, when they are attacked on that Quarter, they do it with great Humility and Moderation; whereas in purſuing other Arguments on that Subject, they wax more Confident, and ſhew greater Spirit and Courage? In this Conteſt of late, Mr. *Hoadly* is almoſt an Original on that point: And I ſee not how any indifferent Perſon can concur with him in it. Suppoſe a Foreigner ſhould be inquiſitive (as we our ſelves often are concerning tranſmarine Churches) about the authentick Doctrines of the Church of *England*, and ſhould read theſe Homilies, is it poſſible for him to conceive, they did allow of Reſiſtance in any caſe? If a Native ſhould yet tell him, that they are plainly reconcilable with Reſiſtance in ſome caſes, would he not expect from him a full Proof from thoſe Sermons, or not believe him, or think that he believed himſelf? Nay, ſhould good part of the Clergy poſitively tell him, that notwithſtanding the expreſs Letter to the contrary, there was a latent *Diſtinction, which would be found out, when Men thought they needed it*; would he ever look into the Records of the Church of *England* again, or believe that there was

Faith

Faith in Man, or that any Word or Writing could ever be read or underſtood? Do but ſhew by what Evaſion, theſe Homilies can be made to patronize Reſiſtance of the Higher Powers in whatever caſe, and I will engage to reconcile *verbatim* the Homilies of Faſting, and againſt Gluttony and Drunkeneſs, with the Vices therein condemned, and prove them to mean really and literally to recommend them, inſtead of condemning them.

[*Part.* IV. *p.* 372. *l. penult.*] Are theſe Words well deſerving your moſt ſerious Conſideration. "Though "not only great multitudes of the rude and raſcal "Commons, but ſometime alſo Men of great Wit, "Nobility and Authority, have moved Rebellions "againſt their lawful Princes, (whereas true Nobility "ſhould moſt abhor ſuch villanous, and true Wiſdom "ſhould moſt deteſt ſuch frantick Rebellion) though "they ſhould pretend ſundry Cauſes; as the Redreſs "of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of all other "Miſchiefs doth moſt deſtroy) or Reformation of Re-"ligion, (whereas Rebellion is moſt againſt all true "Religion) though they have made a great ſhew of "holy Meaning, by beginning of their Rebellions with "*a counterfeit Service* of God, (as did *wicked Abſalom* be-"gin his Rebellion with Sacrificing unto God) though "they diſplay and bear about Enſigns and Banners, "which are acceptable unto the rude, ignorant, com-"mon People, great multitudes of whom by ſuch falſe "Pretences and Shews they do deceive, and draw un-"to them: Yet were the multitudes of the Rebels ne-"ver ſo huge and great, the Captains never ſo noble, "politick and witty, the Pretences feigned to be never "ſo good and holy, yet the ſpeedy overthrow of all "Rebels, of what Number, State, or Condition ſoever "they were, or what Colour or Cauſe ſoever they pre-"tended, is, and ever hath been ſuch, that God there-"by doth ſhew, that he alloweth neither *the dignity of* "*any Perſon, nor the multitude of any People, nor the* "*weight of any Cauſe*, as ſufficient for the which the "Subjects may move Rebellion againſt their Princes."

Can

Can any Man plead for Reſiſtance after he hath ſubſcribed theſe Words, or urge, that they are reconcilable with Reſiſtance in ſome caſes? Do theſe Words (as you are uſed ſometimes to ſay) only forbid Reſiſtance to one or few Perſons, on the account of private and perſonal Injuries, but never to the Body of a Nation in the greateſt and weightieſt Cauſes? Be pleaſed to ſhew me one Line in any of your moſt famous Reſiſtance-Authors more plain for Reſiſtance in ſome caſes, than theſe Lines are here totally excluſive of Reſiſtance in all. Can a Man forbear ſaying, a Perſon that ſubſcribes ſuch Diſcourſes, which contain ſo many and ſo ſignificant Expreſſions for Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, (and ſubſcribes them too, as *containing godly, wholſom, and neceſſary Doctrines, and agreeable to the Word of God*) and yet pleads for Reſiſtance from them, is certainly ſelf-condemned? It would be uncharitable to ſuppoſe him otherwiſe: If it would not be a viſible Affront, yet would it be a mental Injury. The thin and inſignificant Fig-leaf of no Man being ſuppoſed to ſubſcribe to the Truth of every Line in the Homilies, will not afford the leaſt Covering to hide the Nakedneſs. If the Homilies do not univerſally (not in one obſcure Corner or Line, but almoſt in every one) plead for Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, there is no Sence in them; and no Man can underſtand them; (they may as well be ſuppoſed to contain a devout Dialogue between the *Pope* and the *Grand Seignior*, or what you pleaſe) and they were wrote to no End or Purpoſe. There are ſome Lines indeed, even in the Words before quoted, that may not hold true in all caſes, ſo as never to fail in one Inſtance, particularly theſe; "Yet were the multitudes of the "Rebels never ſo huge and great, the Captains never "ſo noble, politick or witty; the Pretences feigned to "be never ſo good and holy, yet *the ſpeedy overthrow of* "*all Rebels*, &c." (for there have been ſome proſperous Rebellions, which continued for a great while) yet that doth not hinder me from ſubſcribing (and that moſt willingly, and *ex animo* too) to the Homilies, as containing a godly and wholſom Doctrine, *neceſſary for*

theſe

these Times; what is here affirmed being ordinarily true, and seldom failing. Where there are no Positions maintained, establishing or countenancing erroneous and dangerous Doctrines, destructive to our eternal Salvation, either as to Faith or Practice, I can easily subscribe to a Book as wholsom and useful, (and my Subscription would not be condemned by the sober World) tho' it had some Errors of less moment in it, as to some Mistakes of Misapplication, Chronology, or the like. I believe, scarce a judicious Licenser can be found, who would vouch for the Niceness, and Exactness of every Line in the Book, to which he gives his *Imprimatur*; yet the Author may be of great Reputation for the nobleness of his Subject, the weight of his Argument, and the method of his Discourse. **Your** Patriarch *Julian Johnson* said, *The Homilies were the Books best written, next to the Holy Bible, yet are they not without their lesser Imperfections, tho' the Sum, Substance, and Tenour of them contain a most godly and wholsom Doctrine.* I come now in the

Third and *last place* to answer Mr. *Hoadly*'s moderate Solutions of the Difficulties of reconciling the Homilies and Resistance, and shew both him *(and you more fully)* to be inconsistent and self-condemned, from the inconsistent and contradictory Profession of Resistance in some cases, and the entire Scope, Sence, and Letter of the Homilies, against it in all, to which you both have *willingly* and *ex animo* subscribed; yet would *willingly* and *ex animo* get loose from it. But considering how largely I have already proved the Impossibility of a reconciliation of the Homilies with both his and **your** Notion of Resistance, I might easily be excused from that Task; but will not, to prevent even the smallest Exception: For he, who will not excuse the Homilies from asserting Resistance in some cases, (tho' they speak as plainly against it, as Letters and Sounds can speak to the Eye and Ear) will never excuse the Defender of them on that head, if he fail (tho' there happen afterwards to be no occasion for it) in the least jott, or tittle of his Promise. To the Point then:

Measures

Measures of Submission, p. 158. l. 1. saith Mr. *Hoadly*; " It is manifest, this Subscription was never understood " by any in the Church, to signify, that the Person, " who subscribes, is obliged to believe every individual " Sentence in all the Homilies, and the Interpretation " and Application of every particular Text of Scripture " quoted in them, to be true, just, and reasonable. [*See the Answer to this in the last Page; we are both agreed in that point.*] " The only thing therefore (continues " he, *p. eadem & 159.*) that ever was supposed, either " by Governors, or Governed in this Church, to be in- " tended by this Subscription, was this, That the Per- " son subscribing doth truly believe, that the Tenour of " the Doctrine contained in the Homilies, is just and " right; and that the main Doctrines designed to be " taught in them, are godly and wholsom Doctrines." Right again. Here is the same Agreement still between us. Now let us see, who keeps up most to this Agreement, he, or I; He, that pleads for Resistance in some cases, or I, who allow it in none. You see, Sir! I have produced good part of the Homilies for *Obedience*, and *against Wilful Rebellion*, which (without one Exception, either expressed or implied) commend in Letter, common Sence, and Example, Absolute Non-resistance to the Supreme Magistrate. Is not the Tenour, or main Design, (nay, the whole of them) to shew People the Sin, Folly, and extreme Mischief of Resistance in any case, tho' moved on the most specious Pretence, with powerful Arguments to dissuade them from it? If this be not the Tenour and main Design of these Homilies, I despair of ever knowing, what the Tenour, Design, or Subject of any Author is. If this be not the Tenour, pray shew me what is? You may as well persuade the World, that *Milton's Iconoclastes* was King *Charles's* Εικὼν Βασιλικὴ, as that the Homilies (the perfect opposites to and confounders of all manner of Resistance) are the very Picture and lively Image of that pretended Vertue, but real Vice. If I mistake not, (for a Man ought to be as sure as he can, who deals with such cunning People) the Tenour, or Design of any Author,

Author, is the Proof and Declaration of the Subject of his Book. And are not the Proof and Perſuaſion of Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, the main Subject of the Homilies? There is ſcarce any thing elſe in thoſe Homilies. Should not I affront Mr. *Hoadly*, and all Men of common Senſe, ſhould I offer to ſay, that his late Sermons and Diſcourſes were to be underſtood of an unlimited Obedience, when every Word of them is fully againſt it, and for Reſiſtance in ſome caſes? Is not a partial and qualified Obedience the deſign of them all? And yet the Homilies are no more for a limited Non-reſiſtance, than Mr. *Hoadly*'s Books are for an unlimited one. To ſay the Tenour of the Homilies is for Reſiſtance in ſome caſes, is an inſtance of ſuch Aſſurance, as will not be eaſily parallelled. The B. of *S.* in his Conference with the D. of *Y.* in the Year 1673. could not prove to his R. H. the Doctrine of Reſiſtance in any caſe, from the authentick Records of the Church of *England*. He then knew it not to be there; and therefore preached the contrary Doctrine of Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, both at the *Savoy* and at *Covent-Garden*. Though he had before adviſed that Prince not to depend on that Doctrine of the Church in that point, for that there was a Diſtinction in the Matter, (an inviſible one, and in *petto*) that would be found out, when Men thought they needed it. So that it is to be taken *pro confeſſo*, that Reſiſtance in any caſe was inviſible in the Homilies, till Men thought they needed it to ſerve a preſent Purpoſe, and then it was as plain as need to be deſired. Is not that a rare Faculty, that can prove any thing out of nothing? And doubtleſs it was an act of great Chriſtian Simplicity, Integrity, and diſcharge of Conſcience to the Flock, to conceal from them this great *Arcanum*, under the faireſt Inſinuation, that there was no ſuch thing, until it ſhould be thought convenient to truſt them with it. I ſuppoſe, ſuch bright Evidence of a deeply latent Diſtinction and Reſerve, is to be ſqueezed out of your inexhauſtible Magazine of the Law of Nature, which (well managed) will ſerve for any thing a Man hath a mind to. Suppoſe a Married Man, marvellouſly addicted

addicted to the Flesh, should be caught in Bed with a Woman that doth not very fairly belong to him, and you should charge him with Adultery from the very Letter of God's Law: Might not he as well answer you, and say; 'Tis true, the Carnal Letter of the Law is so, but the Pure Spirit of it is quite otherwise in some emergent Cases; and I have a Distinction, which I always carry about, to relieve me at a Push: For I must tell you, Sir! at present my Wife is at an unapproachable distance, and I could not stay, for the Law of Nature was very prevalent in me; I desire therefore your Excuse. I will undertake as soon to defend this Adulterer by such a subtil Distinction and Reserve, as the violent Resister of the Supreme Magistrate; and I am sure, (but that is not my peculiar Province at present) that such an Adulterer hath, and ought to have as much Benefit and Relief from the Letter and Sence of the Law of God, as such a Resister of the Supreme Civil Magistrate. But this only by the way. Wherefore to proceed:

[*Pag. ead.*] Says Mr. *Hoadly*, "It is to be presumed, "that the Homilies were not understood, at their "first appearance in the World, to condemn the Re- "sistance of Subjects to their Princes in Case of ex- "treame Necessity; both from the Principles publickly "espoused by Mr. *Hooker*, the greatest Defender of the "Church; and from the Acts of the Clergy in Convo- "cation assembled, in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign; who "esteemed it Glorious, to Assist oppressed Subjects "against their Princes. And this is the stronger Ar- "gument, because it is very incredible, either that the "Clergy at that time should not understand the true "Meaning of this Homily; or that they should so soon "contradict what they had so solemnly Subscribed to. "So that here is a very *probable Demonstration*, not only "that it was not intended by the Authors of it to con- "demn Resistance in all Cases; but also, that it was not "at first understood so to do by any considerable part of "the Clergy of *England*." But it ought to be observed, that Presumption is never to go against plain Evidence

and Senſe, nor is admitted to do ſo in any Court. The univerſal Scope of the Homilies is evidently and ſenſibly againſt all manner of Reſiſtance in all Caſes; ſo that no Caſe is to be preſumed to be excepted againſt the expreſs Declarations to the contrary: And if the Principles of Mr. *Hooker*, and the Practices of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Convocation be inconſiſtent with the Homilies, the Homilies (which are eſtabliſhed by the whole Power of Church and State) ought to be the Rule of our Actions; not the Actions of any Perſons, how great or numerous ſoever. One Line, or any juſt or true Inference from the Homilies, authorizing Reſiſtance in any Caſe, would have been of more weight, than the inconſiderate Actions of a Thouſand People. But this is not all. I have now argued only on Suppoſition, that every Word Mr. *Hoadly* hath ſaid, is true. But I know not where Mr. *Hooker*'s Principles approve of Reſiſtance in any Caſe. To my Mind, his Opinion, That Government was founded upon Compact, doth not neceſſarily imply it: For if this Kingdom was now Elective, after a due Election of the King, that King would be ſtill irreſiſtible by all the Laws of the Land. And the Acts of the Convocation (I ſuppoſe Mr. *Hoadly* means their granting Subſidies to carry on a War, by aſſiſting the Subjects of our Enemy, to reſiſt their Lawful Prince, to our Martial Advantage) have been eſteemed by wiſe and good Men not very defenſible; however, (I dare ſay) they did not plead the Homilies in their Juſtification; tho' God knows, it hath been, and (for ought I ſee) is ſtill like to be, (tho' that doth not make it one jot the more Lawful) the too common Practice of the World. All this is only pleading Practice againſt Principle; it is by Principle, (tho' all the World were againſt us) that we muſt order and juſtify our Practice. Mr. *Hoadly* ſays, the Convocation could not underſtand the Homilies in the Sence of abſolute Non-reſiſtance, (tho' the plain Letter and Sence of them be for it, and he hath not, nor can diſprove it,) becauſe they granted a Subſidy to our Prince, to encourage Foreign Subjects to rebell againſt theirs; *i. e.* becauſe Practice might not be

T. for Echard's Hiſtory, Vol. 2. p. 4

be so very agreeable unto Principle. And yet, is all this more strange and surprizing, than to hear Bishops and Priests of the Church of *England* plead for the Lawful Mission of one Ordained only by Presbyters, contrary to the plain Sence and Meaning of the Twenty-third Article of our Religion, to which they have consented; which says, " It is not lawful for any Man " to take upon him the Office of publick Preaching, or " Ministring the Sacraments in the Congregation, be- " fore he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the " same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called, " and sent, which be chosen and called to this Work " by Men, who have publick Authority given unto " them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers " into the Lord's Vineyard? " And that none but Episcopally Ordained are here understood, (if any thing can be understood) is most notorious; in as much as the Church of *England* will never receive others into Clerical, (unless they take Orders from us) but only into Laical Communion. And yet have we not had Men of the Highest Rank (*cum multis aliis*) in the Church, who have asserted the Article not to exclude pretended Presbyterian Ordinations? And yet, can any thing be plainer, than that the Authentick Records of the Church of *England*, interpreted by uniform Practice, are fully against it? Are the Homilies so much for Resistance in any Case, as the Article seems for Presbyterian Ordination? And yet, tho' some of our Clergy are (at least Complementally, and by way of Civility and good Neighbourhood, out of the plenitude of their Moderation,) for the Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, no wise Man would think it a real Prejudice to the Sence of the Article, (notwithstanding their Opinions, and perhaps sometimes Occasional Practices too) taken solely, and exclusively of any other, in an Episcopal Sence. Here is the Case: The Homilies are most flagrantly against Resistance in any Case. Queen *Elizabeth*'s Convocation subscribed them; yet contributed to the Assistance of the *Dutch* against their Lawful Prince, the King of *Spain*. I do not pre-

tend to justify or reconcile this. Several Clerical Church of-*England*-Men now-a-days plead for the Lawfulness of Presbyterian Ordination, yet have they directly opposed it by their Assent to the Twenty-third Article of Religion: Neither can I justify, or reconcile that. If a Man would understand the Sence of a National Church in any Point, he ought to consult its Authentick and Established Doctrines, (especially when they are so plain, that it is impossible to force them to any other Sence) and not the Practices, even of the greatest Number of its Professors, whom sometimes Interest, Inadvertence, or Prejudice may incline to act contrary to their Principles. And no doubt, but that at the same time that Convocation granted these Pecuniary Aids for carrying on of Resistance abroad, some of the Members of it published and declared as much against all manner of Resistance at home. The Term, *Probable Demonstration*, is a little unintelligible to me. I always thought before, that Demonstration had been evident, and had carried the greatest Conviction with it: But now I find Mr. *Hoadly*'s Demonstrations are only probable; and what is only probable in the common and usual acceptation of the Word, may not be; so there is some Comfort on my Side. This was modestly done of him; so that after all, what Mr. *Hoadly* has demonstrated from Mr. *Hooker* and the Convocation, is only probable even to himself; and I dare say, would be improbable (as to just Consequences) to far the largest part of Mankind, if they were to judge of it. These Proceedings, I have said, have been thought by divers Wise and Good Men not to be defensible. But now I add farther, in answer to Mr. *Hoadly*, that if he will take my Lord of *Sarum*'s Authority for it, the Convocation might think themselves to have a much fairer Plea for their Subsidies than himself has allowed them. For we are told (in the History of the Reformation, *Part.* II. *B.* 3. *p.* 416.) that the King of *Spain*'s keeping Garisons of *Spaniards* in the *Netherlands*, together with *many other things*, was *contrary to the* Lætus Introitus, *that had been agreed to when he was received to be their Prince*;

And

And that the *People finding all Terms broken with them, and that by that Agreement they were disengaged from their Obedience, if he broke those Conditions,* (and not till then) *did shake off his Yoke.* What Mr. *Hoadly* will say to this Authority, I know not; but it seems to me totally to overthrow his *probable Demonstration.* Yet it is but what he may see confirmed by other Testimonies, at the 34th Page of the learned and judicious *Defence of the Profession which the Right Reverend Father in God* John *Lord Bishop of* Chichester, *made upon his Death-Bed.* Lond. print. 1696.

[*Pag. ead. & 160.*] " It is to be presumed like-
" wise, that in after-times, even when the Doctrin of
" Passive Obedience came to its height, many consi-
" derable Church-Men, and those esteemed the greatest
" Patrons of Non-resistance, never did understand the
" Design of that Homily to have been to condemn
" Resistance in all Cases. This is to be presumed, I
" say, from hence, that they have not been able to
" deny that there are possible Cases, in which Resist-
" ance is allowable. Many confess the same at this
" Day, who are yet accounted great Defenders of Non-
" resistance: And Dr. *Falkner* and others, have ac-
" knowledged the same in publick. " Mr. *Hoadly* is again upon his Presumptions, as if he was not so sure of his Cause. If the greatest Patrons of Non-resistance have not been able to deny, that there are possible Cases, in which Resistance is allowable; and many such confess it at this Day, what Occasion is there for presuming upon their Evidence? If the Case be so, it is beyond Presumption, it is Certainty; *Demonstration,* somewhat beyond *probable.* But he is so modest here to conceal their Names, (as well as their Arguments) except that of Dr. *Falkner.* And if the rest of his Evidence behind the Curtain be no more for him than Dr. *Falkner,* I fear he will, he must be cast: For though Mr. *Hoadly* hath not told us in this Place, where Dr. *Falkner* is on his Side; yet, I presume, he means it in his *Christian Loyalty*; where, to the best of my Memory, (and I am confident I do not mistake) his Instance will prove only the Recital of the *Hypothesis*

of another; I mean Bishop *Bilson*; and even that Bishop allows of no Resistance where the Laws forbid it; as ours do, over and over.

[*Pag. ead.*] " If there were an Homily absolutely " condemning all Resistance in Children to the Pa- " rents, (as this is said to condemn all Resistance of " Subjects to their Princes) and any one should allow " of Resistance in Children, upon Supposition, that a " Father should attempt their Lives; let him never so " much declare how improbable, and next to impossi- " ble he imagins it, that this should ever come to pass; " yet this Allowance is as truly a Contradiction to such " an Homily, as any other Allowance can be. What " I would infer from hence is this: That as considera- " ble Patrons as Passive Obedience ever had, even in " those Times, in which it was carried to the height, " did not imagin, that it was the Design of the Ho- " mily against Rebellion, to condemn Resistance in all " Cases: For otherwise surely they would not have " contradicted their own Subscription, by allowing it in " any possible Case. " To these possible Cases I shall say nothing, unless they had been here laid before me. But this I shall say in the mean time, That the Case of Resisting the Supreme Civil Magistrate by the Subject, and of the Natural Parent by the Child, will not hold; for if the Natural Parent prove unnatural to his Child; the Power of the Civil, (the Superior Power, and Common Parent of them both) on Application, will relieve them; and if in extream necessity the Child should repel Force with Force, this can never be proved lawful, unless it be upon the presumed Consent of the Magistrate for the same; in as much as he would avenge the Injured, if he was at hand. And that even this will justify it, is more than Mr. *Hoadly* will ever be able to prove. But the Case of the Prince is still more plain, because he is the Supream Power on Earth, and therefore there can ly no Appeal against him: And doth not Mr. *Hoadly* know this to be the constant and current Doctrin of the Homilies? Yes, he doth in that very Homily he hath not thought fit to speak to, tho' he hath Subscribed

to

to it, as well as to the other: I mean, the Homily for *Obedience to Rulers and Magistrates*, [*Part* II. *pag.* 66. *lin.* 37.] where begin these remarkable Words, in an Objection, and Answer thereunto: "But peradventure some "here would say, that *David* in his own defence might "have killed King *Saul* lawfully, and with a safe Con- "science. But holy *David* did know, that he might in "*no wise* withstand, hurt, or kill his Sovereign Lord and "King; he did know, that he was but K. *Saul*'s Subject, "though he were in great Favour with God, and his "Enemy K. *Saul* out of God's Favour. Therefore, tho' "he were *never so much provoked*, yet he refused utterly "to hurt the Lord's Anointed; he durst not for offend- "ing God and his own Conscience, (although he had "occasion and opportunity) once lay Hands upon God's "high Officer the King, whom he did know to be a Per- "son reserved and kept *(for his Office-sake) only to God's* "*Punishment and Judgment*; therefore he prayeth so oft "and so earnestly, that he lay not his Hands upon the "Lord's Anointed." And if Mr. *Hoadly* would make the Parallel between Resisting the Prince and the Parent to run smoothly, *quatuor pedibus*, he should tell us, it is as good Divinity and Law, if a Father prove incorrigible to his Son, (and his Son must be Judge of that, not by a Judgment of Discretion only, but also of Authority) to depose and murder him, and seize upon his Estate, as in the like Cases to do so by my Prince. This Mr. *Hoadly* is obliged to do, if he would maintain his Parallel between resisting a violent Father and a violent Prince. I scarce believe him hardy enough yet, on the greatest Provocations, to say, If my Father is stark naught to me, I may therefore conscientiously knock him on the Head, and seize on his Estate, for my Consolation; and yet he is obliged to say so, if he would this way illustrate his Example of Resistance.

[*Pag.* 161.] Here he is presuming again, saying; "The same may be presumed from the Practice of many "Great Men of unsuspected Zeal both for the Church "and for the Doctrin of Passive Obedience in particu- "lar; who either joined in inviting over the Prince of

" *Orange*, to defend this Nation againſt the late King " *James*; or approved of the firſt Motions of the late " Revolution; or went ſo far as to bear an Active Part " in them. From which one cannot but conclude, that " they did not imagin the Doctrin of the Church of " *England* to be againſt Reſiſtance in all Caſes." To this I preſume, (like a poor paſſive Priſoner at the Bar) to make a ſmall Objection, in Point of Law: ——— and without giving any farther Reaſon why, to challenge ſo many of the Jury. But if the Court be pleaſed to over-rule me, and will not ſuffer my Challenge, but the good and true Men impanneled muſt determin the Cauſe between our Sovereign Lord the People, and Me, I am content, and think Myſelf not in much Danger: For ſince the whole Jury muſt unanimouſly agree on their Verdict, before they can bring me in Guilty, Mr. *Hoadly* knows, I am in a ſecure condition of Life and Limb, even from that Quarter.

[*Pag. ead.*] He comes to his Fourth Preſumption, ſaying: " The ſame may be preſumed likewiſe from " the Notions *of late*, publickly eſpouſed by many " Perſons of great Authority and Reputation in the " Church; who lodge the *Kingly Power* in theſe Na- " tions, not in the Perſon of the Prince, but in All " who bear a Part in making our Laws: By this " Means confining Paſſive Obedience to the Laws, " and abſolving from all Obligation to Non-Reſiſtance " to the Prince, acting in Contradiction to the two " Houſes of Parliament, or the eſtabliſhed Laws of the " Land. He ſays, ſome Notions *of late* have been " eſpouſed by many Great Eccleſiaſticks, that the " Kingly Power in theſe Nations is not lodged (ſingly) " in the Perſon of the Prince, but in All who bear a " Part in Making our Laws." Doth not this argue a little Guilt? He ſays, *Theſe are Notions eſpouſed of late*; ſo not the old and former Notions of the Kingdom: which argues, they are not the ſtanding Law of the Land. And if I may make ſo bold, I would tell Mr. *Hoadly*, as little verſed as I am in the Law, I will undertake before any Lord Chief Juſtice in *Europe*, to

maintain

maintain from the universal currency of our Municipal Laws, even to this Day, that the sole Political Power of the King of *England* is inseparably annexed to his Royal Person, and no where else. But it is no wonder to me, to find Him assert a coordinate Power of Regal Authority seated in the People, who from the Homilies (than which, nothing under Heaven can be plainer against it) asserts in the People a Superior Power (and then, What is become of his Coordinate?) to the Regal, properly so called; for that they necessarily have, if they can call the Prince to an Account in his Personal and Political Capacity. Methinks, Mr. *Hoadly* miserably betrays his Cause, in saying, "Whoever "reads the Homily, must *evidently see*, that the chief "Design of it was not to press Obedience under this "Notion, *(this Notion, as he himself confesses, taken up of late)* "but with respect to the Prince considered by "himself; unless such favourable Suppositions, and "qualifying Interpretations *(contrary to the Letter and Sence of every Doctrine and Law, both in Church and State; a modest Request indeed!)* "be allowed, as I "have reason to fear, will be denied to me." He owns, that the Homily *is evident, (a more satisfactory Term than probable Demonstration)* that the sole Kingly Power (and consequently the Supreme irresistible, is seated in the Person of the Prince, "unless such favour-"able Suppositions, and qualifying Interpretations be "allowed, as he hath reason to fear *(and so he hath indeed)* "will be denied him:" Such wild Suppositions, and Interpretations as he himself confesses to be but Notions *of late*. Is not this like Truth extorted, and Conviction? May it proceed to Conversion. Do you not think his Great Ecclesiasticks are much obliged to him? He says, the *new* Notion of the Kingly Authority (and new it is indeed) absolves the Subjects from their Allegiance, if the King acts not only in contradiction to the established Laws of the Land, but to the two Houses of Parliament; saying, "By this means "confining Passive Obedience to the Laws, and ab-"solving from all Obligation to Non-resistance to the "Prince,

" Prince, acting in Contradiction to the two Houſes of " Parliament, or to the eſtabliſhed Laws of the Land." I ſuppoſe, he will prove it from the 12th and 13th of King *Charles* II, which Laws are in full Force to this Day in all Inſtances, (as you cannot deny) except we ſhould grant you a little Relaxation in one ſingle Caſe, of a Prince Turning Papiſt, or Marrying one; and then, *Exceptio firmat Regulam in non exceptis.* And they declare, " That neither the Peers, nor Commons, " nor both together, nor the People, collectively nor " repreſentatively, *in Parliament*, nor out of Parlia- " ment, nor any other Perſons whatſoever, have any " *Coercive* Power over the Kings of *England.* And " that the Sword is ſolely in the King's Power; and " that neither one, nor both Houſes of Parliament can " or lawfully may raiſe or levy War Offenſive or DE- " FENSIVE againſt his Majeſty." I know not well what he means, by *the King's acting in Contradiction to the two Houſes of Parliament.* I hope, he is not under hand inſinuating the Legality of an Ordinance, inſtead of an Act of Parliament. If he is, let him look to himſelf.

" But this is not all, ſaith he, *p.* 162. I have to ſay " on this head; *(if it be, you have ſaid very little)* tho' " this, one would think, ought to make ſome Perſons " a little more tender in their Cenſures, *(I muſt deal plainly and ingenuouſly with you, Mr.* Hoadly, *it raiſeth my Cenſure and Suſpicion of Self-condemnation much more)* " for I ſhall be ſo bold, after all the Confidence ſome " have expreſſed to the contrary, to appeal to the Ho- " milies themſelves; *(agreed on)* and to affirm, that " it cannot be proved to have been the deſign of the " Homily *againſt Rebellion (to condemn Rebellion)* to " condemn that Reſiſtance, which I have taught, or " to teach that Paſſive Obedience, which I have con- " demned."

P. eadem he ſays, " The deſign of the firſt part of this " Homily is to prove, from ſeveral Texts of Scripture, " the Dignity of Princes, and the Duty of Subjects, *(according to his Principles he ſhould have ſaid, The Dignity of Subjects, and the Duty of Princes)* " and that the moſt

" that

" that is here inferred, is, that Subjects ought to be " obedient, not only to their good and courteous, but " alſo to their ſharp and rigorous Princes." Now here Mr. *Hoadly* would inſinuate, as if it meant no more, than Submiſſion to a Prince, that was ſomewhat imperious and vexatious to ſome of his Subjects; (for ſuch may be ſaid to be ſharp and rigorous, tho' they are not downright Tyrants) whereas the Inſtances (*P.* 357.) of the firſt Chriſtians under the Emperor, either *Caligula*, *Claudius*, or *Nero*, and of the *Jews* under *Nebuchadonoſor*, in the *Babylonian* Captivity, (unleſs my Eye-ſight fails me) are perfectly exemplary Commands from God himſelf, to Subjects to ſubmit patiently under the ſevereſt Provocations; and a demonſtration to me, that the Compilers of the Homily produced them purely for that purpoſe. Agreeably whereunto the ſame Homily ſaith expreſly (*P.* 355.) from Scripture, *When the wicked do reign, then men go to ruin*; *a fooliſh Prince deſtroyeth the people*; *and a covetous King undoeth the ſubjects*; (Mr. *Hoadly*'s Character of a tolerable Prince, if the Homilies be on his ſide) yet ſuch are not to be reſiſted with violence, if we have Faith enough to believe this Homily in the following Queſtion and Anſwer; and then the former Paragraph concludes with theſe Words, " Thus " ſpeak the Scriptures, thus Experience teſtifieth of good " and evil Princes: Princes, not only perſonally, but " politically and extremely Evil." But now if Mr. *H.* would reconcile his new Notions and the old Homilies together, he muſt prove ſolidly, that the *Roman* Emperors were only now and then guilty of ſome petty Offence againſt their Subjects, (though no Princes profeſſing Chriſtianity ſince, can be proved guilty of more Tyranny, than thoſe Heathen ones were; and yet their Subjects were obliged in conſcience not to reſiſt them) or that *Nebuchadonoſor* never but twice or thrice invaded the *Liberty* and *Property* of a ſmall number of worthleſs *Jews*. He muſt prove likewiſe, that to *make men go to ruin*, *to deſtroy the people*, and *to undo the ſubjects*, (Terms expreſſive of the greateſt Tyranny and Deſolation to vulgar Capacities) ſignify no more than a tolerably

ſharp

ſharp and rigorous proceeding of the Prince, not to be coerced by his Notion of Reſiſtance: And when he hath done this, I will leave him to be chaſtiſed by his dear Friends, the Men of *large Thoughts*, and *larger Liberties*. He proceeds, [*P. eadem & ſequenti*] " Now " this muſt be confeſſed by all to extend to Active, as " well as to Paſſive Obedience; (meaning Obedience to evil Princes) " if therefore it ought not to be inferred " from hence, that it was the deſign of this Paſſage, to " urge the Neceſſity of Active Obedience in all poſſible " caſes, (which is the greateſt Indignity that can be " offered unto it) neither can it be inferred, that it was " the deſign of this Paſſage to inculcate an Abſolute " Paſſive Obedience." Now this muſt be confeſſed by all, ſaith Mr. *Hoadly*; pray conſider a little; for by your favour (Sir!) this is denied by all Men of Senſe and Honeſty; even by the one ſide of your ſweet ſelf Subſcribing, in oppoſition to the other ſide of you obſtinately Contradicting. Read your Condemnation in the ſecond Part of the *Sermon of Obedience*, p. 67. After the plaineſt Declarations for Abſolute Non-reſiſtance, from the famous Example of *David*, there are theſe *Anti-Hoadleian* Words: " Yet let us believe " undoubtedly (good Chriſtian People) that we may " not obey Kings, Magiſtrates, or any other, (though " they be our own Fathers) if they would command us " to do any thing contrary to God's Commandments. " In ſuch a caſe, we ought to ſay, with the Apoſtle, " *We muſt rather obey God, than Man.* But *nevertheleſs* " in that caſe we may not *in any wiſe* withſtand violently, or rebell againſt our Rulers, or make any Inſurrection, Sedition, or Tumults, either by force of " Arms, (or otherwiſe) againſt the Anointed of the " Lord, or any of his Officers: But we muſt in ſuch " caſe patiently ſuffer *all Wrongs* and *Injuries*, referring " the judgment of our Cauſe *only to God*." To charge the contrary as the Confeſſion of all Mankind, what ſhall I call it? It is an act of the moſt uncommon Aſſurance, and ought to be treated accordingly, if there be ſuch things in nature, as Truth, Modeſty, and Cou-

rage,

rage, to be maintained. Had Mr. *Hoadly* found but the thousandth part of so much for Active Resistance, in any one particular place, there would have been no living for his Triumph; he would have given his Arguments better Titles, than of *Presumptions* and *probable Demonstrations*.

Again, [*P. eadem*] "I grant indeed, saith he, that "the Lawfulness of all Rebellion to undiscreet and "evil Governors is *absolutely* denied, but chiefly, as it "is manifest, upon this foundation, Because Rebellion "is the greatest of all Mischiefs, and Rebels the "naughtiest of Subjects, ever readiest to rebell against "the best Princes; and therefore not fit to be trusted, *(How? take away presently that Power you so liberally bestowed)* "or encouraged to pass any Judgment upon "the Conduct of their Princes." If the Lawfulness of all Rebellion to undiscreet and evil Governors be *absolutely* denied, you yield all I contend for; for I think I have fully proved, that by such are meant, in the Sence of the Homilies, the worst of Tyrants. Your Adverb *(chiefly)* will give you no relief; for there may be several Reasons for condemning the same thing, yet no good Reason to justify it, as in the present Case of Resisting for some Causes. "But doth this look (contiues Mr. *Hoadly)* as if the same Persons, who wrote "this, would have said the same against Resistance in "all cases? Nay, I think it rather evident from the "Account they constantly give of Rebellion and Rebels, and from this very Passage, that they would "not have said the same, with respect to those Cases, "in which the best of Subjects, and those, who are "ever ready to obey good Princes, *(that is, if they like "them)* are generally convinced, that Resistance is "necessary, not for any private Ends of their own, *(Who ever said so?)* "but merely for the Defence and "Preservation of the Happiness of the Publick." Let all the World judge: Read these Lines in the fourth part of the Sermon against *Wilful Rebellion*, p. 372, 373. "Though not only great Multitudes of the rude and "rascal Commons, but sometimes also Men of great

"Wit,

" Wit, Nobility, and Authority, have moved Rebel-
" lions againſt their lawful Princes, (whereas true No-
" bility ſhould moſt abhor ſuch villanous, and true
" Wiſdom ſhould moſt deteſt ſuch frantick Rebellion)
" though they ſhould pretend ſundry Cauſes, as the
" Redreſs of the Commonwealth, (which Rebellion of
" all other Miſchiefs doth moſt deſtroy) or Reforma-
" tion of Religion, (whereas Rebellion is moſt againſt
" all true Religion) though they have made a great
" ſhew of holy Meaning, by beginning their Rebel-
" lions with a *counterfeit* Service of God, (as did wicked
" *Abſalom* begin his Rebellion with Sacrificing unto
" God) though they diſplay and bear about Enſigns
" and Banners, which are acceptable unto the rude
" and ignorant common People, great multitudes of
" whom by ſuch falſe Pretences and Shews they do
" deceive, and draw unto them: Yet were the multi-
" tudes of the Rebels *never ſo huge and great, the Cap-*
" *tains never ſo noble, politick and witty, the Pretences*
" *feigned to be never ſo good and holy*, yet the ſpeedy
" overthrow of all Rebels, of what Number, State, or
" Condition ſoever they were, or what Colour or
" Cauſe ſoever they pretended, is, and ever hath been
" ſuch, that God thereby doth ſhew, *(read attentively)*
" that he alloweth neither the Dignity of any Perſon,
" nor the Multitude of any People, nor the Weight of
" any Cauſe, as ſufficient for the which the Subjects
" may move Rebellion againſt their Princes." Can Mr. *Hoadly* ſtand againſt this Lightning in his Face? The greateſt Act of Charity is to believe, he hath taken all by Tradition, and that he never read the Homilies either before, or ſince his Subſcription. Do you find here, that either *Lords or Commons are truſted, or encouraged to paſs any Judgment on the Conduct of their Princes?* I mean a Judgment of Authority, not of Diſcretion. Is not the plain contrary declared in as ſignificant Terms, as the Invention of Man is capable of producing? Correſpondently to which doth not the firſt part of this Homily ſay, *p.* 355. " What a peri-
" lous thing were it to commit unto the Subjects the
" Judgment,

" Judgment, which Prince is wise and godly, and his " Government good, and which is otherwise; as tho' " the Foot must judge of the Head: An Enterprise " very heinous, and must needs breed Rebellion." He says, the Words *undiscreet and evil Governors*, are capable of infinite degrees, *p. eadem.* They may be so, but the Homilies declare them to be taken in the utmost Latitude and Extent, or else there is no Meaning in Words.

Again, saith he; *p.* 164. " It is indeed declared, " That a Rebel is worse than the worst Prince, and " Rebellion worse than the worst Government of the " worst Prince, that hitherto hath been: But this ra- " ther convinceth me, that they would not have said " the same of all Resistance, *(tho' they do say it in as plain Words as can be framed)* " than make me con- " clude the contrary" *(because they do.)* That is, it is declared, and it is not declared. Cannot this Man prove any thing at this rate? and by any Medium? Saith the Homily, in utter Abhorrence of Resistance of all Sorts and for all Causes, a *Rebel*, that is, one who useth violence to his Prince, (for of such, as every one sees, is the whole Scope of the Homilies) is worse than the worst Prince, and Rebellion worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince, that hitherto hath been. No, saith he, it means, that a bad Prince is worse than the worst Rebel; and Rebellion better than the bad Government of such a Prince. Is not this to proclaim to the World, it ought not to believe one Word Mr. *Hoadly* says on this subject, purely because he says it? To understand that a Rebel is better than a bad and tyrannical Prince from these Words, That *a Rebel is worse*, &c. is it not (what is storied of Witches in relation to their Prayers) to read the Lines backwards before we can apprehend the Sence of them? " No- " thing can be more evident, saith he, than that " this cannot be affirmed of some Instances of Resist- " ance, because the Authors of this Homily give after- " wards such an account of Rebellion, and of Rebels, " as doth not at all touch the case of Resistance for the

" necessary

" neceſſary Defence of Publick Happineſs, but doth " indeed wholly exempt that from the Imputation of " Rebellion, or from being concerned in what they " ſay againſt it." Nothing can be more evident, than that the Homilies do mean, that Submiſſion to the worſt Prince, under the greateſt Provocations, is more eligible, than the leaſt violent Reſiſtance maintained by Principle; and therefore they exclude all manner of Reſiſtance: For if Reſiſtance be once allowed by Principle on the greateſt Pretence, it will be frequently undertaken on the ſlighteſt, if Power and Opportunity concur; and therefore the Homily, and the Laws of God and Man, eternally exclude it on all accounts; for on ſuppoſition of an unavoidable Evil, the leaſt is to be choſe and endured: Tyranny before Rebellion. What is generally better, is for the publick and common Good of Mankind. And it is generally better to ſuffer patiently under the greateſt Tyrant, than by reſiſting to try for Redreſs; for when Arms are once raiſed, it is ſeldom in the power of thoſe, who raiſe them, to cauſe them to be laid down, when they pleaſe: However it is a great uncertainty, which no wiſe Man would commend or follow. For the Truth of it I appeal to the Hiſtories of the World, and let them tell, which hath ſhed moſt Blood, the Cruelty of Tyrants, or the Practice of Reſiſting them. Violent Reſiſtance therefore is *toto genere* unlawful, and ſo the Homilies expreſly teach. But you ſhall no more take my word for it, than you ſhould Mr. *Hoadly*'s. Repeat therefore out of the fourth part of the Sermon againſt *Wilful Rebellion*, p. 373. theſe Words; " God " thereby, ſaith the Homily, (ſpeaking of the fearful " End of Rebels) doth ſhew, that he alloweth neither " the Dignity of any Perſon, nor the Multitude of any " People, nor the Weight of any Cauſe, *(methinks this might ſatisfy a moderate Man)* " as ſufficient for " the which Subjects may move Rebellion againſt " their Princes." Doth not the Homily here plainly imply, that the leaſt Reſiſtance, and for the moſt ſpecious Cauſe maintained on Principle, is worſe than Tyranny?

Tyranny? And I hope a Cauſe is to be maintained by Principles, and not by extraordinary and unforeſeen Chances and Accidents, ſuch as Mr. *Hoadly* diſputes for in this caſe. What doth this Author mean by ſaying, *(ſure, he is at his Prayers backwards again!)* "The Authors of this Homily give afterwards ſuch "an account of Rebellion, and of Rebels, as doth not "at all touch the Caſe of Reſiſtance for the neceſſary "Defence of Publick Happineſs?" Do they not ſay at large, in Periods before quoted, "That though "Men of great Wit, Nobility, and Authority, have "moved Rebellions againſt their lawful Princes, to "*redreſs the Commonwealth, to reform Religion,*" &c. yet it was Rebellion ſtill? Was ever a Rebellion yet moved againſt the Supreme Magiſtrate, but under the Notion of the Publick Good and Happineſs? Not one in the World; nor never will be. No Man pretends to it for the Redreſs of his private Injuries; that would look too narrow and ſneaking, tho' *Self* is commonly at the bottom of all: And if it prove ſucceſsful, let me ſee the Man that will not ſay or ſwear afterwards, that it was originally deſigned for the Publick Good. "Beſides, (continues he) in this very place, Rebellion "is ſpoken of, as an unfit Medicine to reform any "ſmall Lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little Griefs "in Government: Which cannot be applied to that "Reſiſtance, *(yes, it can, and muſt, if it be applied to all Reſiſtance)* "which is made to preſerve a State from "that Ruin, which is evident and certain without it." But Mr. *Hoadly!* it is not over-fair to omit the following two Lines; but then indeed your whole Plot had been diſcovered and ſpoiled. He quotes theſe Words, (tho' what hath been ſaid juſt before, is enough to deſtroy his Argument with any reaſonable Man) "That "Rebellion is an unfit Medicine to reform any ſmall "Lacks in a Prince, or to cure any little Griefs in "Government;" thinking thereby to deceive the unwary Reader, as if the Homily meant, that becauſe Reſiſtance was a Medicine unfit to reform ſmall Faults in a Prince, or Government, ~~that~~ therefore it followed,

 that

that it was a very fit and proper Medicine in great and extreme Abuſes of the Sovereign Authority: Whereas the two Lines immediately following, put the matter of Abſolute Non-reſiſtance beyond diſpute; ſaying, " Such lewd Remedies *(of Reſiſtance)* being far worſe *(there is no compariſon between them)* " than ANY " OTHER Maladies and Diſorders, that *can be* in the " Body of the Commonwealth." This I hope is ſpoken Abſolute enough. " It is here ſaid likewiſe, ſaith he, " that we muſt pray for the Prince, whether good or " evil, *i. e.* as it is here explained, for his continuance " and increaſe in Goodneſs, if he be good; and for his " Amendment, if he be evil: Which I think *(think again, ſecond Thoughts, they ſay, are beſt)* " is as con- " ſiſtent with Defending our ſelves from being ruined " by him, as the Praying in like manner for our Ene- " mies, is with our defending our ſelves againſt them." If he means (as I cannot perceive what he means elſe) that we have as much Authority to defend our ſelves by violent Reſiſtance againſt our tyrannical Prince, as againſt our Enemies, becauſe we are obliged to pray as much for the one, as for the other; I muſt tell him, he is under a great Miſtake: For tho' there is the ſame Abſolute Command for Praying for our Enemies, as there is for Abſolute Obedience to our Prince; yet the Caſes of Paſſive Obedience are unequal. The whole Law and Practice of the World have ever been for lawful Wars under lawful Princes againſt publick Enemies; as particularly God commanded his beloved People the Jews, to fight with, and deſtroy the Idolatrous Nations; whereas there is no one Example or Command in the Old Teſtament, for Subjects to riſe up againſt their natural Prince, in any caſe. The like allowance has alſo been made for Self-defence, (where the Power of the Magiſtrate could not be timely called in to the Aſſiſtance of the injured Perſon) againſt private Aſſaults; and S. *John* Baptiſt fairly owned the lawfulneſs of Violence in ſome caſes, when he gave the Soldiers good Advice, without condemning their Character or Profeſſion. But as for Reſiſtance to the Prince,

you

you have no Exception in Scripture, Reaſon, or Law, to countenance, much leſs to authoriſe it. And I am ſure, the Supreme Power in every Nation is neceſſarily, and by all Laws irreſiſtible: If it were not ſo, it could not be the Supreme Power; and that Supreme Power here, is lodged in our King or Queen. Methinks it is a ſtrange piece of Aſſurance in Mr. *Hoadly*, when the Homily had but juſt before, *p.* 356. anſwered the Objection, "But what if the Prince be undiſcreet and "evil indeed, and is alſo evident to all Mens Eyes that "he is ſo? by telling us, That we ought by no means "to reſiſt him, but to pray for his Converſion and "Amendment;" It is a ſtrange piece of Aſſurance, I ſay, to tell us after this, that yet we may do it, as well as reſiſt a *Tory* or *Rapparee*; and by parity of Reaſon that by *Praying for his Amendment*, is meant, *that God will enable you to deſtroy him*, if you can, for fear he ſhould ſerve you ſo firſt. The Profeſſion of which Doctrine of Reſiſtance, and his juſt Suſpicion and Jealouſy, that you will put it into practice on occaſion, is the likelieſt way to provoke him to it.

[*Pag.* 165.] At the end of the Homily, ſaith he, "The Wickedneſs of the Rebellion then on foot, is ſet "forth, with a principal View to which, and the "Popiſh Pretences for Rebellion, this Homily was com-"piled; which would make one apt to think it very "hard, to urge the Doctrin of it againſt ſuch a Reſiſt-"ance as hath been found neceſſary for Preſervation of the "Proteſtant Religion, and the Guarding againſt theſe "ſame Popiſh Enemies, at whom this Doctrin was "chiefly directed." That is to ſay, becauſe the Compilers of the Homily had then in View a Rebellion carrying on by Papiſts, therefore they could never be ſuppoſed to condemn one carried on by Proteſtants at any time on the ſame Principles. For let me ask; Do none elſe ever uſe the ſame Pretences, how averſe ſoever they profeſs themſelves to Popery? Conſult a while an ingenious Paper on this Subject, entituled, *Two Sticks made one, or, the Devil upon Dun.* Rebellion is Rebellion, whoever be guilty of it; and Religion hath nothing to

do in it. Have you forgot these few Words in this Homily, [*Pt.* 4. *p.* 373.] Rebellion is most against all true Religion, *(and therefore is not allowable in, or for it ;)* or cannot you remember two Leaves farther in your own Book, where [*p.* 168.] you say: "They speak likewise here of the Pre-"tences used by Rebels, particularly that of Religion, "(which I have not concerned my self with.)? And yet you do concern your self with it, and make it a laudable Cause of Resisting the Supreme Magistrate; when you say but two Leaves before, [*viz. Pag.* 165.] "It would make one apt to think it very hard, to urge "the Doctrin of it against such a Resistance as hath "been found necessary for Preservation of *the Protestant* "*Religion*." So, forgetful Mr. *Hoadly!* Within the compass of two Leaves! What follows to the end of the Paragraph, is a Continuation of the Argument of Dominion being founded in Grace: For if the Homilies, in injoining Absolute Obedience, had only respect to the Prince, as being of the Reformed Religion, it must be so, *if Resistance be found necessary for Preservation of the Protestant Religion*; and you know what a Papist is to us, the same we are to them. Would not this in the intrinsick Merits of the Cause, (had they pleaded it,) have been an excellent Vindication of the *Powder-Traytors*, or any other *Romish* ones, who thought their Religion as true, as we think ours, and as justly to be defended or promoted by *War* or *Weapons?* But I trust, *We have not so learned Christ.*

[*Pag.* 165.] He comes to consider the Second Part of this Homily, and says, "The Design of it is, to alledge "one Example or two out of the holy Scriptures, of the "Obedience of Subjects, not only to their good and "gracious Governors, but also unto their evil and unkind "Princes; as it is there expressed. And this will help "very much towards our judging what sort of Disobe-"dience it was, which the Authors designed to condemn. "Now the first and chief Example here alledged, is that "of *David*, in his Behaviour towards *Saul*. And as to "this, it is fully sufficient to remark, that the Cause "between *Saul* and *David* being purely Personal, and "of a Private Concern: and the Charge against *Saul*

"relating

" relating meerly to his Perſonal Vices; all that can " follow from hence, ſuppoſing the Example of *David* " to oblige our Conſcience, *(he doth not fairly tell you, it " doth)* is this, That it is not lawful for Subjects to en- " deavour to dethrone, or murder a Prince for Vices " meerly Perſonal, or on any Account of a Private " Nature." And can Mr. *Hoadly* believe, that the Caſe of *Saul* and *David* in all its Circumſtances, was purely Perſonal? No, he cannot, nor no Man believes that he can; or at leaſt that he can believe, the Homilies mean no more. Can he read the Demands and Anſwers in this Caſe, and not believe the Compilers of the Homily to underſtand them in the Sence of the Common Caſe of all Subjects under the Adminiſtration of the worſt Princes? All Injuries are in ſome ſenſe Perſonal; in as much as a Community can no more ſuffer, except in its Individuals, than Univerſals can ſubſiſt without their Particulars. So, that if a King may not be reſiſted for Private and Perſonal Injuries, he may not for Publick and Political ones; and if he may for Political, he may for Perſonal; for the Caſe of one, is the Caſe of all: And he that can deſtroy me and my Family to day, without my daring to reſiſt him, may deſtroy my Neighbours to morrow, and ſo on, until he hath finiſhed his Work. Read the Demands and Anſwers, and explain them to me (if you can) in any other Sence, than of abſolute Non-reſiſtance to the worſt of Princes under the Calamity of National and Political Evils. To read them to you, is enough to confute you, without any other Argument: I have done it before in this Paper, and ſhall now call on you again to explain them, ſo as to make them quadrate with your Sence of Private and Perſonal Injuries. They run thus: " Now let *David* anſwer to ſuch Demands, as Men " deſirous of Rebellion do uſe to make. Shall not we, " ſpecially being ſo good as we are, riſe and rebel " againſt a Prince, hated of God, and God's Enemy, " and therefore likely not to proſper either in War or " Peace, but to be hurtful and pernicious to the Com- " monwealth? No, ſaith good and godly *David*, God's

" and *such a King's* faithful Subject: and so convicting
" such Subjects as attempt any Rebellion against such a
" King, to be neither good Subjects, nor good Men. But
" say they, shall we not rise and rebel against so unkind
" a Prince, nothing considering or regarding our true,
" faithful, and painful Service, or the Safeguard of our
" Posterity? No, saith good *David*, whom no such
" Unkindness could cause to forsake his due Obedience
" to his Sovereign. Shall we not, say they, rise and
" rebel against our known, mortal, and deadly Enemy,
" that seeketh our Lives? No, saith godly *David*,
" who had learned the Lesson that our Saviour after-
" ward plainly taught, that we should do no Hurt
" to our Fellow-Subjects, tho' they hate us, and be
" our Enemies, much less unto our Prince, tho' he
" were our Enemy. Shall we not assemble an Army
" of such good Fellows, as we are, and by hazarding
" our Lives, and the Lives of such as shall withstand
" us, and withal hazarding the whole Estate of our
" Country, remove so naughty a Prince? No, saith
" godly *David*; for I, when I might, without assem-
" bling Force, or Number of Men, without Tumult,
" or Hazard of any Man's Life, or shedding of any drop
" of Blood, have delivered my Self, and *my Country*, of
" an Evil Prince, yet would I not do it. Are not
" they, say some, lusty and courageous Captains, va-
" liant Men of Stomach, and good Men's Bodies, that
" do venture by Force to Kill and Depose their King,
" being a naughty Prince, and their mortal Enemy?
" They may be as lusty and courageous as they list, yet
" saith godly *David*, they can be no good nor godly
" Men that so do: for I not only have rebuked, but also
" commanded him to be slain, as a wicked Man,
" which slew King *Saul*, mine Enemy; tho' he being weary
" of his Life for the loss of the Victory against his Enemies,
" desired that Man to slay him. What shall we then
" do to an evil, to an unkind Prince, an Enemy to us,
" hated of God, hurtful to the Commonwealth, *&c.*?
" lay no violent Hands upon him, saith good *David*,
" but let him live, until God appoint and work his
" End,

" End, either by natural Death, or in War, by lawful " Enemies, not by trayterous Subjects. And which is very obſervable, immediately after theſe Demands and Anſwers, ſaith the Homily; [*Pag.* 362.] " Thus " would godly *David* make anſwer: and St. *Paul*, as " ye have heard before, willeth us to pray for *ſuch a* " *Prince.*" Which demonſtrates, that the Compilers of it did plainly underſtand the Words of St. *Paul* to be meant of Obedience to the moſt cruel and tyrannical Prince; and that Mr. *Hoadly* muſt know they did ſo, tho' he could Subſcribe and Retract (backwards and forwards) but not Own it, for valuable Conſiderations. Mr. *Hoadly* ſaith, the Caſe of *David* was purely Perſonal. Now *Saul*, in the Proſecution of his Malice againſt *David*, at one time ſlew 85 of the Prieſts, and deſtroyed a whole City for their ſakes, together with all that belonged to it, Women, Children, and Cattel, (read the Hiſtory in the firſt Book of *Samuel*) for innocently favouring and aſſiſting *David*; and tho' *David* had afterwards at the Cave of *Engedi*, and in the Camp, an Opportunity of delivering himſelf and his Country, (*his Country, ſaith the Homily, ſo that the Compilers thought ſuch Caſes to be a common and political Infraction on the Rights of the Jews*) from ſo ingrateful a Tyrant, yet he could not be perſuaded to be ſo *Glorious a Deliverer*, but confeſſes, he could not ſtretch forth his Hand againſt the Lord's Anointed, and be guiltleſs. Did any Man before hear of ſuch Injuries, purely perſonal and private? At this rate all Injuries are perſonal and private. I fear, Mr. *Hoadly!* if your Prince ſhould do but half ſo much Injury in her Kingdom, you would quickly tell her, She muſt appear before your Judgment-Seat, and anſwer to ſuch things as you would heavily lay to her Charge. If the caſe of *David* was only a caſe of Injuries, of a quality purely private and perſonal, then a Prince may knock half his Clergy on the Head, and *Glenco* a Clan or two, and yet ſtill be the irreſiſtible Anointed of the Lord: And never to be otherwiſe, except when we have diſmal Apprehenſions (*O terrible! who can bear the Thoughts of it?*)

that he will ſwallow the Nation at one ſingle Gulp, or (like the poor diſtracted *Iriſh*, ſince you was born) with an handful of Men maſſacre the whole Nation in one Night. He ſays, " Theſe are all Examples (of " which the Caſe of *David* is the firſt and moſt per- " tinent) of private Perſons, ſubmitting in Inſtances " not inconſiſtent with the Publick Good of that Na- " tion they belonged to." Then I perceive it is not inconſiſtent with the Publick Good of a Kingdom, (at leaſt it is not worth vindicating by theſe meek Patriots) to have ſeveral Hundred of its Subjects at one time inhumanly Butchered at the Will of a ſingle Perſon; (as was the Caſe of the Prieſts, and their City *Nob*) for it is moſt evident, that after all theſe national Injuries, (*Mr.* Hoadly *may generouſly call them little and private ones, if he pleaſe*) *David*, tho' he had all the external Signs of Providence on his ſide, (good Providence, that often is made uſe of to help out at a dead Lift, and is a *Turkiſh* Argument for any Chriſtian thing) however refuſed it, and confeſſed, if he had not, he ſhould have been guilty of the foulеſt Rebellion. Is this your way, Mr. *Hoadly!* of defending *Liberty* and *Property?* Pray, Sir! conſider now, whether that be true, which you ſay in the latter end of this Page, " That there is not the leaſt ſhadow of a diffe- " rence between the Doctrine I have taught, and this " ſecond part of the Homily;" or indeed, whether every Word you have ſaid, be not the fainteſt Shadows, without the leaſt Solidity or Subſtance, and whether it doth not entirely contradict the whole Sence of the Homily.

I proceed next to his Reconciliation of the third part of this Homily with his Hypotheſis. He ſays, *p.* 167. " It is remarkable, that in their Account of Rebels, " they ſpeak of a few Subjects, out of a Luciferian " Pride and Preſumption, ſetting themſelves up againſt " the Majeſty of their Prince, againſt the Wiſdom of " the Counſellors, againſt the Power and Force of all " the Nobility, and the faithful Subjects and People " of the whole Realm. From whence it ſtill more

" plainly

" plainly appears *(plainer and plainer without doubt)* " that it was not the design of this Homily, to con- " demn such a Resistance as is founded entirely upon " the Publick Good; especially if it be judged neces- " sary by the Counsellors, Nobility, and main Body " of the whole Nation." Now a plain-dealing Man reading this of Mr. *Hoadly*'s would be apt to conclude, (if he never saw the Homilies) that (according to them) Rebellion could be no other than a Resistance of the Magistrate by a few hot-headed People, for personal Causes, either real or pretended: But not so, when the greater or nobler part of the Subjects should do it gravely and demurely for the Publick Good. But this is spoke only *ad captandum Populum*, contrary to the Knowledge and Conscience of this Author. Read but these Words in the fourth and next part of this Homily, *p.* 372, 373. (pray pardon me that I am forced to repeat) and you will see. " Though not only great Multitudes of " the rude and rascal Commons, but sometime also " Men of great *Wit*, *Nobility*, and *Authority*, have mo- " ved Rebellions against their lawful Princes, (whereas " true *Nobility* should most abhor such villanous, and " true *Wisdom* should most detest such frantick Rebel- " lion) though they should pretend sundry Causes, as " the Redress of the Commonwealth, (which Rebel- " lion of all other Mischiefs doth most destroy) or Re- " formation of Religion, (whereas Rebellion is most " against all true Religion) though they have made a " great shew of holy Meaning, by beginning their Re- " bellions with a counterfeit Service of God, (as did " *wicked Absalom* begin his Rebellion with Sacrificing " unto God) though they display and bear about En- " signs and Banners, which are acceptable unto the " rude ignorant common People, great Multitudes of " whom by such false Pretences and Shews they do " deceive, and draw unto them, yet were the Multi- " tudes of the Rebels never so *huge* and *great*, the Cap- " tains never so *noble*, politick, and witty, the Preten- " ces feigned to be never so *good* and *holy*, yet the " speedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what *Number*,

" *State*,

" *State*, or *Condition* ſoever they were, or what *Colour* " or *Cauſe* ſoever they pretended, is, and ever hath been " ſuch, that God thereby doth ſhew, that he alloweth " neither *the Dignity of any Perſon*, nor *the Multitude of* " *any People*, nor *the Weight of any Cauſe*, as ſufficient " for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion a- " gainſt their Princes." Do not theſe very Words expreſly condemn ſuch a Reſiſtance, as is ſaid *to be founded on the Publick Good* both of Church and State, by Men of *great Wit*, *Nobility*, and *Authority*, *although it be judged neceſſary by the Counſellors*, *Nobility*, *and main Body of the Nation?* It could not be a ſucceſsful Rebellion, without the main Body of the Nation; and no Rebellion was ever yet, or can be raiſed, but under the appearance of the Publick Good: People will not come into it, till they are made to believe ſo. The Sence of the Homily, is, That ſometimes Rebellion is raiſed by the meaner ſort of People, ſometimes by the nobler, but that a violent Reſiſtance of our Prince by either, is that Rebellion: And when it is raiſed by the nobler and better ſort, it is the more ſcandalous and wicked; ſaying, " Whereas true Nobility ſhould moſt abhor ſuch " villanous, and true Wiſdom ſhould moſt deteſt ſuch " frantick Rebellion;" meaning the violent Reſiſtance of the Prince in any Caſe, or for any Cauſe, as the Homilies literally forbid.

" In the fourth part, ſaith he, [*P. eadem & ſequente*] " the Authors produce Inſtances of Rebellion, which " are all Inſtances of Reſiſtance to good Governors, " grounded upon baſe and private Motives: Which " makes it yet more probable, that their deſign was " not to condemn ſuch Self-defence in any People, as " is manifeſtly neceſſary for their own Preſervation." Dares Mr. *Hoadly* ſtand to this? Hath he forgot the Caſes of the *Jews* under *Nebuchadonoſor*, and of the Primitive Chriſtians under the *Roman* Emperors, ſignificantly related in the firſt part of this Sermon? Either Self-defence (called manifeſtly neceſſary for our Preſervation) is perfect Cant, (as indeed it is, when it means Violence oppoſed to the Supreme Magiſtrate, as

is

is the plain Sence of the Homilies) or neceſſary Self-defence will not juſtify Reſiſtance againſt the greateſt Tyrant. I refer you to theſe Words, in *p.* 375. "Shall "the old Chriſtians, by S. *Paul*'s Exhortation, pray for "*Caligula*, *Claudius*, or *Nero*? Shall the *Jews* pray for "*Nebuchadonoſor*? Theſe Emperors and Kings being "Strangers unto them, being Pagans and Infidels, be-"ing Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppreſſors of them, "and Deſtroyers of their Country, Countrymen and "Kinſmen, the Burners of their Villages, Towns, Cities, "and Temples? And ſhall not we pray for, *&c.*" No, bring him to the Block, if we have a godly Jealouſy that he is in Rebellion againſt us. "Is it probable now, "good Sir! that becauſe the Authors produce Inſtances "of Rebellion, which are all Inſtances of Reſiſtance to "good Governors, grounded upon baſe and private Mo-"tives, that therefore it makes it yet more probable, "that their deſign was not to condemn ſuch Self-defence "in any People, as is manifeſtly neceſſary for their "own Preſervation? He ſays, They ſpeak likewiſe here "of the Pretences uſed by Rebels, particularly that of "Religion, (which I have not concerned my ſelf with) "and that of the Redreſs of the Commonwealth, in "treating of which, they do not ſay that there are no "Caſes, in which Reſiſtance may be for the Good of "the Commonwealth." Do they not plainly ſignify ſo much to the People, (and even Mr. *Hoadly* may be juſtly ſuppoſed not to have forgot it, when he uſeth almoſt the ſame Words in ſpeaking of Reſiſtance, raiſed for the ſake of Religion, and for the Redreſs of the Commonwealth) where ſpeaking of the general Misfortune of all Rebels, even in this Life, [*p.* 373.] they ſay thus: "Yet the ſpeedy overthrow of all Rebels, of what "Number, State, or Condition ſoever they were, or "*what colour of Cauſe ſoever* they pretended, is and ever "hath been ſuch, that God thereby doth ſhew, that he "alloweth neither *the Dignity of any Perſon*, nor *the Mul-"titude of any People*, nor *the Weight of any Cauſe*, as ſuf-"ficient for the which the Subjects may move Rebellion "againſt their Princes?" Indeed (Sir!) were it not to

oblige

oblige you, and perform my Promiſe, I would overlook and deſpiſe ſuch ſorry, inconſiſtent, and contradictory Stuff.

[*P. eadem*] "In the two remaining parts of this Homily, ſaith he, the moſt uſual Cauſes of Rebellion are "ſet forth, *viz. Ambition* and *Ignorance:* From whence "it will again appear evident, that the deſign of the "Authors was not againſt ſuch a Reſiſtance, as is manifeſtly neceſſary for the Publick Good; but againſt "Rebellion founded upon private Ambition, and groſs "Ignorance." And are not *Ambition* and *Ignorance* ſuch Cauſes of Rebellion, whether it be raiſed by *Papiſts* or *Fanaticks?* The Principles and Cauſes of Rebellion are ſtill the ſame, let them come from what Quarter they will: Was not the Proteſtant Rebellion of 41 as much cauſed by Ambition and Ignorance, as the *Spaniſh* Invaſion (encouraged by ſome of our Popiſh Subjects) 1588. And cannot the whole World in one Century afford one ſingle Inſtance more? Had the Church and State (after the Reſtauration of K. *Charles* the Second) aboliſhed our Homilies againſt Rebellion, and framed new ones as much againſt all Reſiſtance, as the former, and they had had only a plain reference to the Rebellion, then juſt extinguiſhed, would it have been thought a good Plea for the *Papiſts* in the *Popiſh Plot* to have cried, Theſe Homilies could never deſign to affect them; for that they plainly referred to a *Fanatick Rebellion* and no other? And that thoſe very Homilies were thought even by K. *William* (tho' the Rebellion in K. *Charles*'s Days was carried on, *not only by great Multitudes of the rude and raſcal Commons, but alſo by Men of Wit, Nobility, and Authority too*) to condemn all manner of Reſiſtance, (whether promoted by *Papiſt*, or *Puritan*) may be collected from hence, that the two firſt parts of the Homily againſt *Wilful Rebellion*, (the moſt flaming parts of that Sermon againſt Reſiſtance of all Characters and Denominations) were ordered then to be read, (in caſe of no Sermon compoſed by the Prieſt on the ſame ſubject) and are continued by the ſame Authority unto this Day, on every 30th day of *January*. Was not the Rebellion of

41

41 (if I dare so call it) raised under the appearance and profession of the necessary Publick Good? Some things in the Administration were out of order, and wanted some small Redress. The People fly to Arms; and tho' Redress was made, and Compensation super-abundant, yet still it went on for the Publick Good. That was the Word. The ambitious and designing Men knew otherwise, but would persuade the ignorant and credulous it was so. Were not *Ambition* and *Ignorance* here the Causes of a Rebellion, which was not Popish, tho' carried on by Popish Principles, and much encouraged and assisted by divers of that Party? All the Laws of God and Man condemn Resistance in any case, for that the Remedy (an hundred to one) is worse than the Disease. And tho' a Man should have Power enough to oppose his Prince, and should do it only upon the greatest Provocations; yet if he be overcome, he will receive the due Punishment of his Sin here, (beside the after-reckoning) and if he should himself conquer, yet is he not sure, he can lay the Devil of Rebellions Power, he hath once raised. Remember 41 again. " In all which, (continues Mr. *Hoadly*) " there is no case put of a whole Nation in imminent Danger of Ruin." Read again in the first part of the Homily against *Wilful Rebellion*, *p.* 357. the Cases of the Primitive Christians, under the persecuting *Roman* Emperors, and of the *Jews*, under the *Babylonian* Tyrant; where the last is said to have *Slain their King, Nobles, Parents, Children and Kinsfolks; to have burnt their Country, Cities*, &c. (which Mr. *Hoadly* will hardly allow to be but tolerable and personal Injuries) and both *Babylonian* and *Roman* Princes are said to be *Murderers, Tyrants, and cruel Oppressors of them*, &c. which yet both Jews and Christians (in the full Sence of the Homilies at least) are forbid in any wise to resist. And if those People and Nations could not be said to be in imminent Danger of Ruin, and to have a noble Title to Mr. *Hoadly*'s Benefit of Resistance; (howsoever here forbid to resist, unless praying for, be resisting of such Tyrants) I say, if those People and Nations could not be said to be in imminent Danger of Ruin, (not the whole

whole Nation in a ſtrict Sence, for that is equally impoſſible every where, unleſs you can ſuppoſe at the ſame time an univerſal Maſſacre of all Parties) I defy Mr. *H.* or you (his rural Proxy) to ſhew me one Hiſtorical Account of the moſt tyrannical Popiſh Prince, that ought to be reſiſted. If theſe reſpective States were not in imminent Danger from *Nebuchadonoſor*, and ſome of the *Roman* Emperors, then no State in the World can be, from the moſt cruel *Popiſh* Tyrant, and conſequently none ſuch are to be reſiſted with Violence. Will you allow, Sir! that a *Popiſh* Prince may torment his Subjects one twentieth part ſo much, as *Nero* did the Chriſtians, and *Nebuchadonoſor* the *Jews*, before you ſuffer them to turn back and reſiſt; and then I will ſay ſomething more to you? Thus much for Mr. *Hoadly*, and his faſt Friend the Homilies. I have nothing more to ſay, only to two or three Words in his Recapitulation.

" It appears, ſaith he, from the general Expreſſions " made uſe of, that the Authors no more intended in " it Abſolute Paſſive, than Abſolute Active Obedience. " But I ſay, from a particular Expreſſion in the Ho- " mily *of Obedience*, *(perhaps that Homily is not Canonical with Mr.* Hoadly, *becauſe in his Vindication he hath ſlipt it)* " they plainly intended ſuch a thing." Read theſe Lines, (I am forced often to repeat, if not to convert, yet to ſhame, if poſſible) *p.* 67. " Yet let us believe un- " doubtedly (good Chriſtian People) that we may not " obey Kings, Magiſtrates, or any other, (though they " be our own Fathers) if they would command us to do " any thing contrary to God's Commandments. In " ſuch a caſe we ought to ſay, with the Apoſtle, *We " muſt rather obey God, than Man.* But *neverthelefs* in " that caſe we may not in any wiſe withſtand violent- " ly, or rebell againſt Rulers, or make any Inſurrection, " Sedition or Tumults, either by force of Arms, (or " otherwiſe) againſt the Anointed of the Lord, or any " of his Officers: But we muſt in ſuch caſe patiently " ſuffer *all Wrongs and Injuries*, referring the judgment " of our Cauſe *only* to God." Is Active Obedience here commanded as much as Paſſive? Mr. *Hoadly!* this is

in-

intolerable. This is (like *Bellarmine*, by the help of the Papal Authority) to make Vice, Vertue; and Vertue, Vice, at your Sacred Word; and by the Plenitude of your Power, to make any thing ſignify any thing, or every thing, or nothing, (tho' never ſo diſtant and contrary) according as your Holineſs is diſpoſed. " Again, ſaith he, " it appears from the Words frequently uſed, " and the Examples alledged, that they chiefly deſigned " their Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance with reſpect to good " Princes, or ſuch as were only guilty of perſonal Vices, " or of Inſtances of Injuſtice of a private Nature; not " of any manifeſt Attempts to ruin the Conſtitution " and Nation committed to their Charge." Again, ſay I, from the Words frequently uſed, and the Examples alledged, that they wholly deſigned their Doctrine for Non-reſiſtance to the worſt, as well as to the beſt Princes, unleſs to reſiſt in *no Caſe*, ſignifies to reſiſt in ſome Caſe; and to reſiſt for *no Cauſe*, to reſiſt for ſome Cauſe; or that *Caligula*, *Claudius*, *Nero*, or *Nebuchadonoſor* were paſſable Princes; or that when *Saul* ſlew almoſt one hundred of the Prieſts, and all living Creatures in one whole City for their ſakes, it was but a tolerable and perſonal Injury. He ſays, " That it was " not their Deſign, or in their Thoughts to condemn " ſuch a Reſiſtance, as is founded entirely upon the " Publick Security, but that founded upon baſe and " unworthy Motives." Is not this to tax the Convocation with Self-condemnation, (and the Parliament too, which gave a Civil Sanction to the Homilies) and to tell the World, they do not mean what they plainly ſay, when they condemn all manner of Reſiſtance upon any Motive or Pretence whatever? Mr. *Hoadly*, perhaps, would take it ill, if any one ſhould ſay, He is ſelf-condemned; and yet it is not in my power (for tho' a Man may act what he will, he cannot think what he will) to believe otherwiſe. He ſays, The Authors of the Homilies do not mean, what they plainly ſay; and yet it is impoſſible for him, or the Wit of Angels or Men to prove it. I ſay, he profeſſes one thing, and ſubſcribes another; and yet pretends to

ſtand

ſtand by, and reconcile that Subſcription with that Profeſſion. Whether I have proved my Charge, I leave you or any one elſe to judge. " And if after ſo " plain a Demonſtration (continues he) that I have " not contradicted the main Tenour and Deſign of " this Homily, any one ſhall think it ſufficient to pro- " duce any little piece of a Sentence brought in by the " bye, which is in appearance againſt me, conſidered " by it ſelf, it will not much concern me." No, I dare ſay, you are a Man of too much Mettle, to yield to any Proofs in this caſe. Now would not a Man (without ſeeing the Homily) preſently imagine, that the whole Tenour of that Homily, (and of the other too) had been for Obedience to only good or tolerable Princes, but for Reſiſtance to very bad ones; with (perhaps) ſome dark and obſcure part of a Sentence intermixt, which might ſeem (inconſiſtently) now and then to favour the Caſe of Abſolute Non-reſiſtance? Would not a Man in his Wits think ſo by Mr. *Hoadly*'s invincible Courage? And yet the whole Tenour, Scope, and Deſign of theſe Homilies, are for Abſolute Non-reſiſtance without the leaſt Exception, or Reſerve by the bye, or elſe Mr. *Hoadly*, and ſome few (exceſſively few) of his undermining Moles are the only *Lyncei* in the World. Pray, try your Hand, and ſee, where you can ſhew the Tenour of the Homilies in any caſe of Extremity, to be for Reſiſtance. " The only Reply, (concludes he) to " what I have here offered, muſt be to ſhew, either " that the Subſcription imports more than an Agree- " ment to the chief Doctrines and main Tenour of the " Homilies; *(it is enough for me that it certainly imports ſo much)* " or that my Doctrine is againſt the main " Tenour of the whole Homily againſt Rebellion." Whether I have done that, is left to your Examination.

Thus, Sir! have I performed my Promiſe unto you, and expecting the Performance of yours, in ſhewing me, either where I have been defective in the omiſſion of one material Argument brought by you, or Mr. *Hoadly* (your Champion) in relation to Reſiſtance and the Homilies, (which is the only Subject at preſent of diſpute between

between us) or in not throughly anſwering thoſe I have examined, I remain

Reverend Sir!

——— Your affectionate Friend and faithful Servant

July 3. 1710.

Semper Idem.

FINIS.

ADVERTISEMENT.

WHereas the Author of this Letter hath been credibly informed, that the Perſon concerned in it hath frequently and publickly boaſted, that he has an unanſwerable Reply to it, and as perfect in its kind as ever was extant, and has been dared and challenged by him to a Publication of what is here written, with Promiſe of as publick an Anſwer to it; that Gentleman therefore may pleaſe to take notice, that his Challenge being accepted, and what he deſired being accordingly publiſhed, the Performance of his Promiſe is now expected; and an Aſſurance is hereby given him, that if the Author cannot return him an effectual Rejoinder, he will forthwith become his Proſelyte, will confeſs his Obſtinacy in defending Homilitical Non-reſiſtance, and will thenceforward own himſelf a profeſſed Whig.

ERRATA.

ERRATA *in y^e 2^d Part.*

PAge 29. l. 26. r. *æquus*. P. 58. l. 32. *for* de r. be. P. 76. l. 27. r. haled. P. 81. l. 38. r. *Lactant. Inſtit.* P. 87. l. 33. r. ἐπιχειρῆσαι. P. 113. l. 1. *for* my r. I. P. 135. l. 1. r. has. P. 148. l. 38. r. *Rigaltius*. P. 217. l. 13. *for* to the point r. to his purpoſe. P. 220. l. 19. *after* the Queen's r. [or at other times, the King's.] P. 239. l. 40. r. not to be for the good of ſome. P. 251. l. 1. r. ſhews us far. P. 260. l. 9. r. a good. P. 262. l. 7. and ſatisfied.

In the Letter.

PAge 1. l. 19. r. forbid. P. 2. l. 18. r. your own. P. 13. l. 11. r. that the whole. P. 14. l. 23. r. irreſiſtible. P. 19. l. 35. read ſuch Tyrants. P. 24. l. 11. for ? r. . L. 16. for *any* r. *and*. P. 26. l. 15. r. your Patriarch. P. 27. l. 25. for *this* r. *the*. P. 29. l. 13. r. Adulterer. P. 36. l. 2. r. Motions. P. 55. l. 35. r. or cauſe. Beſides ſome few Miſtakes in the Crotchets.

Thesaurarium Mathematicæ:

OR THE

TREASURY

OF THE

MATHEMATICKS.

CONTAINING

Variety of useful Practices in *Arithmetick*, *Geometry*, *Trigonometry*, *Astronomy*, *Geography*, *Navigation* and *Surveying*.

AS ALSO

The Mensuration of *Board*, *Glass*, *Tiling*, *Paving*, *Timber*, *Stone* and *Irregular Solids*.

LIKEWISE

It teacheth the Art of *Gauging*, *Dialling*, *Fortification*, *Military-Orders* and *Gunnery*: Explains the *Logarithms*, *Sines*, *Tangents*, and *Secants*: Sheweth their use in *Arithmetick*, &c. To which is annex'd a Table of 10000 *Logarithms*, *Log-Sines* and *Log-Tangents*.

Illustrated with several *Mathematical Sculptures* on Copper-Plates.

Originally Compos'd by J. TAYLOR, Gent.

And now carefully Revis'd and Corrected.

To which is added, The Use and Practice of several *Propositions* and *Problems* throughout the whole Work, as also the Description and Use of both *Globes*, and some of the chiefest *Mathematical Instruments* both for Sea and Land. With many other considerable Additions and Improvements.

By *W. Alingham*, Teacher of the *Mathematicks*.

Printed by *J. L.* for *W. Freeman*, at the *Bible* against the *Middle-Temple-Gate* in *Fleetstreet*. 1707.

Some BOOKS *Printed for and Sold by* W. FREEMAN, *at the* Bible *in* Fleet-ſtreet.

THere is newly Printed an Excellent Book, Entituled, *Arithmetick*; Or the Ground of Arts, Teaching that Science both in Whole Numbers and Fractions: To which is added a New Treatiſe of Decimals, Tables of Simple and Compound Intereſt, *&c.* By *Edward Hatton*, Philomercat. *Price* 5 *s.*

The Elements of *Euclid* Explain'd, in a *New*, but *moſt Eaſie Method*: By that Excellent Mathematician, *F. C. F. Milliet de Chaleſ*, of the Society of *Jeſus*: Now made Engliſh. *Price* 4 *s.*

A *New Method* of *Fortification*: By Monſieur *de Vauban*, *Engineer-General* of *France*. Done into Engliſh, and Illuſtrated with 32 Copper Plates. *Price 6 s.*

The *Gentleman's Dictionary*, Explaining all the Terms relating to the *Riding* and *Manage* of the *Great Horſe*, the *Military Art*, *Artillery*, &c. The *Art of Navigation* and *Naval Affairs*. Written by the Sieur *Guillet*, and Dedicated to the *Dauphin*; With large Additions, Alterations and Improvements, and above Forty Cuts that were not in the Original. *Price* 5 *s.*

The *Compleat Horſeman*, or *Perfect Farrier*; In Two Parts. I. Diſcovering the ſureſt Marks of the Beauty, Goodneſs and Imperfections of Horſes, the beſt Method of Breeding Colts, making their Mouths, Dieting and Ordering of Horſes. Part II. Contains the Signs and Cauſes of their Diſeaſes, and the beſt Method of Curing them. Written in *French* by the Sieur *de Sollyſell*, Querry to the preſent *French* King, and one of the Royal Academy of *Paris*. Abridg'd from the Folio done into Engliſh, by Sir *William Hope*; With large Additions, and Directions to the Buyers and Sellers of Horſes, in 8°. *Price* 5 *s.*

A *Compleat Guide* for *Juſtices of the Peace*, In Two Parts; Continued down to the End of the Laſt Seſſions of *Parliament*, 1706. With large Additions and Improvements, and Two Orders of Seſſions, One for Limiting the Wages of ſeveral Artificers, Labourers, Servants and Husbandmen; The other for Setling the Rates to be given to Carriers for Carriage of Goods, *&c.* never before Printed in any Book of this Kind. By *J. W.* of the *Middle-Temple*, Barriſter. *Price 6 s.*

The

The Laws againſt *Bankrupts* Explain'd, by ſeveral Caſes, Reſolutions, Judgments and Decrees both at *Common Law* and in *Chancery*; With Directions for Commiſſioners and Precedents, fit for the Peruſal of Lawyers, Merchants and Tradeſmen: By *Tho. Goodinge*, Serjeant at Law. *Price* 5 *s.*

Syſtema Horti-culturæ; Or the *Art of Gardening*: In Three Books. Treating of the Excellency, Situation, Soil, Walks, *&c.* and other Ornaments of *Gardens*; With many Rules and Directions concerning the ſame. Of Winter-Greens, Flowers, *&c.* of the Kitchen-Garden; With Inſtructions for making Hot-Beds, altering and enriching any ſort of Garden-Ground, *&c.* to a very great Improvement of every ſort of Land for Uſe and Profit, Ornament and Delight. Illuſtrated with Sculptures. The Fourth Edition: By *J. Worlidge*, Gent. *Price* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

The *Devout Communicant* Exemplified in his Behaviour, Before, At, and After the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; Practically ſuited to all the Parts of that ſolemn Ordinance. The Ninth Edition. *Price* 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

The *Whole Duty* of a *Chriſtian*: Containing all things neceſſary, both as to what He is to Know and Do for obtaining a Happy Eternity. *Price* 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

An *Infallible Way to Contentment*; In Two Parts Compleat. *Price* 2 *s.*

An *Expoſition of the Church-Catechiſm*, with Scripture-Proofs in Words at Length. The Second Edition. *Pr.* 1 *s.* 6*d.*

The *Church of England's Communicant*, Directed and Aſſiſted by the Publick Liturgy, in 24°. *Price* 6 *d.*

The *Terrible Stormy Wind* and *Tempeſt*, which hapned *Nov.* 27. 1703. Conſider'd, and ought *to be had in Everlaſting Remembrance*; To which is added *Fair Warning* to a *Careleſs World*. *Price* 6 *d.* Theſe Six were all Written by the Author of the *Devout Communicant*.

A Diſcourſe concerning the *Certainty* of a *Future* and *Immortal State*. In ſome Moral, Phyſiological and Religious Conſiderations. By a *Doctor of Phyſick*. *Price* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

A *Manual of Private Devotions*, with Directions for the Sick: By the Right Reverend Father in God, *L. Andrews*, Late Biſhop of *Wincheſter*. *Price* 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

New Obſervations on the Natural Hiſtory of this World of Matter, and this World of Life; Being a Philoſophical Diſcourſe, grounded upon the *Moſaick Syſtem* of the *Creation* and the *Flood*; With ſome Thoughts concerning *Paradiſe*, the *Conflagration of the World*, a Treatiſe of *Meteorology*, and

ſome

some Occasional Remarks upon some late *Theories, Conferences* and *Essays*. *Price* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

The *Anatomy of the Earth*, in 4°. *Price* 6 *d.* These Two were Written by *Tho. Robinson*, Rector of *Ousby* in *Cumberland*.

A Discourse of *Natural* and *Reveal'd Religion*. By Mr. *T. Nourse*, in 8°. *Price* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

The *Law* of *Nature* and *Nations*: Written Originally in Latin by *S. Puffendorf*, Councellor of State to the late King of *Sweden*. Done into English by Mr. *Kennett*. In Folio. *Price* 1 *l.*

A *Compleat History of England*, from before the Conquest to the Death of King *William* the Third; With the *Effigies* of all the Kings and Queens, Curiously done by the best Hands. In Three Volumes, Folio.

The Whole *Critical* Works of Monsieur *Rapin*, In Two Volumes: Done into English by several Hands. *Price* 12 *s.*

The *Compleat Body of Surgery* by *Vaugion*, In 8°. *Price* 6 *s.*

The *Compleat Surgeon*, with a Treatise of Bandages, and many Copper Cuts: By Monsieur *Le Clerc*. *Price* 4 *s.* 6 *d.*

The *Anatomy* of *Humane Bodies* Improv'd, according to the *Circulation* of the *Blood*, and all the Modern Discoveries: By Monsieur *Dionis*, Chief Surgeon to the late *Dauphiness*, and the present Dutchess of *Burgundy*: Done into English and Illustrated with Figures. *Price* 6 *s.*

The *Roman History*, In Four Volumes Compleat. *Pr.* 1 *l.*

Charron of *Wisdom*: Done into English by the Reverend Dr. *Stanhope*, Dean of *Canterbury*. In Two Volumes.

Quarles's *Emblems*, a Curious Edition thereof. *Price* 5 *s.*

Steps of Ascension to God: By the Famous Cardinal *Bellarmine*. Done into English and Reformed, by the Reverend Mr. *Hall* of *Hampstead*. *Price* 2 *s.* 6 *d.*

A *New Voyage* to the *Levant*. *Price* 5 *s.*

A *New Voyage* to *Italy*, In Two Volumes. *Price* 12 *s.*

A New *High German Grammar*: By Mr. *King*, Master of that Language in *London*. *Price* 2 *s.*

Miege's Last and Best *French Grammar*, In 8°. *Price* 2 *s.*

—— His *Grammar* for Foreigners to Learn English *Pr.* 2 *s.*

A New Treatise of Arithmetick: In Three Parts. The *First*, Containing all the Common Rules of *Arithmetick*, in Whole *Numbers* and *Fractions*, both *Vulgar* and *Decimal*. The *Second*, The Demonstration of those Rules. The *Third*, The Use and Application of it in the *Exchequer*, *Custom-House*, *Excise*, *Pay-Offices*, &c. With some Practical *Rules*, *Notes* and *Questions* not hitherto Published. By *W. Alingham*, Teacher of the *Mathematicks*. In 8°.

add ad p. 30. of y^e Letter. Mr Hooker is expresly against Resistance, "May a Body Politick then at all times withdraw in whole or in part y^e Influence of Dominion wch floweth from it, if Inconveniences do grow thereby? It must be presumed, that Supreme Governours will not in such case oppose y^mselves be stiff in detaining that, y^e use whereof is of publick Detriment: But surely without their CONSENT I see not how the Body by any JUST Means sh^d be able to help itself, seeing when Dominion doth cease. Such Things therefore must be thought upon beforehand, that Power may be limited ere it be granted." Eccles. Polity Book VIII. §. 2.